

ERIC Document Resume		See Instruction Sheet		DATE OF RESUME		DATE RECEIVED	
A. PUBLICATION DATA							
1. ERIC NUMBER ED001124		2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S). NA		3. IDENTIFICATION NO. CR 1934		DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW	
4. AUTHOR(S): Corwin, Ronald						MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE YES ☒ NO ☐	
5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: The Development of An Instrument for Examining Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools						COPYRIGHT GRANTED YES ☐ NO ☒	
6. PUBLICATION TITLE: NA						COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED YES ☐ NO ☐	
7. EDITOR(S): NA				8. PLACE OF ORIGIN Org. Dept. of Sociology St. & Anthropology CITY, STATE Ohio State Univ. TELE. EXT. INST/LOC CODE		TYPE OF REPORT PROPOSAL ☐ IN-PROGRESS ☐ FINAL ☒ FOLLOW-UP ☐	
9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE Cooperative Research, Office of Education, Dept. of Health, Educ. & Welfare, Wash., D.C.						OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:	
10. VOL. NA	11. PAGES NA	12. MO./YR. 1963	13. TOTAL PP. 360			ERIC SATELLITE CODE	
B. INDEXING DATA							
14. SUBJECT AREA				15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR Research			
16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)							
education research		school personnel		professionalization			
teacher attitudes		staff conflicts		organizational structures			
school administration		bureaucracy					
17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)							
Described is the first year of a proposed 3-year study. Major objectives were to develop the instrumentation and measurement procedures in preparation for a larger study of the conflicts which occur among professional educators employed in public bureaucracies of varying size and complexity. Two types of conflicts were investigated: (1) friction incidents which have recently occurred between teachers and their administrators, as described by a sample of teachers, and (2) conflicting conceptions of teachers' professional and employee roles as measured by Likert-type status orientation scales. The general thesis is that professionalism is a militant process by which a vocation attempts to gain control over its work. This militancy is likely to be particularly evident in bureaucratic systems where work is regulated by centralized decision-making authorities, standardized rules and procedures, and specialized personnel. The questionnaire and interview technique developed seemed valid when applied to a "control" group. This implies that a further study beyond the seven pilot schools would be in order providing a larger sample and more systematic analysis. (Appendices contain form letters, sample questionnaires, and statistical data.)							
ERIC No. 18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT							
C. FUNDING DATA							
19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION				20. DIVISION OR DEPT.		21. CONTRACT NO.	
						PROJECT NO.	
				22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT			
				23. DURATION OR PROJECT		U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education 6	

**REPRINTED BY PERMISSION
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION**

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN PRINTED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED001124

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN INSTRUMENT
FOR
EXAMINING STAFF CONFLICTS
IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

Cooperative Research Project No. 1934



RONALD G. CORWIN

**Department of Sociology and Anthropology
The Ohio State University**

Final Report

THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN INSTRUMENT
FOR
EXAMINING STAFF CONFLICTS IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Cooperative Research Project No. 1934

Ronald G. Corwin, Ph.D.

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

The Ohio State University

1963

The research reported herein was supported through the
Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education,
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The project has been supported by the Cooperative Research Branch of the U. S. Office of Education. I am grateful to that agency for the helpful cooperation and assistance it has provided me.

My sincere appreciation is extended to the 384 school administrators and teachers who graciously interrupted their busy schedules and applied their thoughts to the topics of this project, though they must remain anonymous. The kind of cooperation and interest in an academic social science problem which these teachers have shown is encouraging, not only because it is essential for the continued development of the scientific study of education, but hopefully, because such cooperative efforts will ultimately provide better information by which educational decision-making can be improved. Special acknowledgement is also due to the Ohio State University High School faculty and administration for their cooperation in one part of the project.

I am indebted to Mr. Lewis Walker, who in his capacity as research assistant, carefully directed the coding and analysis phase of this study; his contribution to the progress of the project has been considerable. Special acknowledgement is also due to Mr. Frederick Brechler, who did most of the field work and supervised the interview analysis.

For their support of the project's objectives and their assistance in securing the cooperation of some of these schools in the sample, special thanks are due to Dr. Louis Harris, President of the Ohio School Board Association; Dr. John Rarseyer, Professor of Education at Ohio State University; and to Dr. Roy Robinson, Wayne State University.

I am also grateful to the following Ohio State University faculty members for their consultation: Drs. Raymond Sletto, Henry Quarantelli, Russell Dynes, J. Eugene Haas, Robert Bullock, Alfred Clarke, Kent Schwirian, and Margaret Helfrich, all of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology; and to Dr. Willavene Wolf and Dean David Clark of the College of Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1	The Problems and Objectives of the Study	1
Chapter 2	Tensions Within Organizational Structure -- The Literature	14
Chapter 3	Role Conflicts and Friction in Organization -- The Literature	84
Chapter 4	The Research Design and Procedures	147
Chapter 5	Development of the Instruments	170
Chapter 6	Preliminary Findings	262
Chapter 7	Summary and Conclusions	293
	Appendices	312

TABLES

Chapter 4		
Table 4-1	Selection of the School Sample	149
Table 4-2	Distributions of High Schools in the Study and in Ohio Samples, by Staff Size	151
Table 4-3	Average Characteristics of Teachers in the Sample Compared to National and Ohio Samples	154
Table 4-4	Respondent Sample	166
Chapter 5		
Table 5-1	Split-Half Correlations of Scale Reliability for Professional and Employee Scales and "Subscales"	174a
Table 5-2	Significance of Mean Employee and Professional Orientation Scale Differences Between High and Low Employee and Professional Validation Groups	182
Table 5-3	Mean Professional and Employee Orientation Scale Scores, By School	185
Table 5-3a	Analysis of Variance of the Mean Professional Scale Scores for the Seven Schools	185
Table 5-3b	Analysis of Variance of the Mean Employee Scale Scores for the Seven Schools	185
Table 5-4	A Matrix of Linear Correlations Among Total and Subscale Scores of the Professional and Employee Orientation Scales	188
Table 5-5	The Distribution of Each Type of Professional--Employee Role Organization, By School	190
Table 5-6	Distribution of Types of Anticipated Initiative and Compliance Expressed by Teachers to Critical Incidents, By Total Sample	201
Table 5-7	Distribution of Types of Anticipated Initiative and Compliance Expressed by Teachers to Critical Incidents, By School	201a
Table 5-8	Distribution of Locals and Cosmopolitans According to Behavior, By School	205
Table 5-8a	Distribution of Locals and Cosmopolitans According to Reference Group, By School	206
Table 5-9	What Teachers Anticipate They Will Be Doing in Two Years	211

Table 5-10	Matrix of Linear Correlations Between Five Job Satisfaction and Vocational Satisfaction Items	213
Table 5-11	Rank Order of the Schools on Indices of Centralized Decision-Making, Standardization and Autonomy of Personnel	217
Table 5-12	Spearman Rank Order Correlations Between Indices of Centralized Decision-Making, Standardization and Autonomy of Personnel	219
Table 5-13	Heterogeneity Ratios, By School	222
Table 5-14	Rank Order Correlations Between Staff Size and Total Heterogeneity of Schools	223
Table 5-15	Autonomy and Prestige Rankings of Types of Departments in the Sample	225
Table 5-16	Proportion of 91 Officers in Professional, Union and Community Organizations Who Were Identified by Two Indices of Informal Leadership	228
Table 5-17	Frequency of Occurrence of Incidents Involving Authority, the Distribution of Scarce Rewards and Values, by Level of Intensity	239
Table 5-18	Frequency of Occurrence of Friction Incidents Between Role Partners, by Level of Intensity	241
Table 5-19	The Rates of Friction Incidents Reported in Interviews and Corroboration and Reliability of Reports, By School	245
Table 5-20a	Frequency of the Occurrence of Validated, Reliable and Non-Validated Reports of Incidents at Each Level of Intensity	248
Table 5-20b	Reports of Friction Incidents Between Role Partners	248
Table 5-21	Conflict Rates in the Schools, Based on Global Measures of Tension in the Questionnaire	251
Table 5-22	Matrix of Selected Rank Order Correlations Between Indices of Rates of Staff Conflict Elicited From Interviews and Questionnaires	252
Table 5-23	Rank Order Correlations Between Rates of Conflict Computed From Interview Reports and From Independent Indicators of Conflict in Questionnaires	257

Chapter 6

Table 6-1	Rank Order Correlations Between Mean Professional and Employee Orientations
-----------	---

	of the Faculties of the Schools and Other Components of Professional Climates	264
Table 6-2	Rank Order Correlations Between Conflict Rates in the Schools and Components of Professional Climates	269
Table 6-3	Rate of Conflict in Schools Whose Faculty Have High, Middle and Low Professional Orientations	273
Table 6-4	Rank Order Correlations Between Mean Pro- fessional and Employee Conceptions and Rates and Content of Conflict in the Schools	275
Table 6-5	Rank Order Correlations Between Mean Pro- fessional and Employee Conceptions and Rates of Conflicts in Schools Computed from Questionnaire Measures	281
Table 6-6	Bureaucratic Characteristics of the Schools and Rates and Types of Conflict	282
Table 6-7	Rank Order Correlation Between Rates and Types of Conflict and Indicators of Hetero- geneity and Staff Expansion and Turnover in the Schools	284
Table 6-8	Rank Order Correlations Between Status Orientations and Indicators of Hetero- geneity and Staff Expansion and Turnover	286
Table 6-9	Rank Order Correlation Between Types and Rates of Conflict and Financial Support	288
Table 6-10	Rank Order Correlations Between Job Sat- isfactions of a Faculty and Status Orient- ations and Rates of Conflict	289
Table 6-11	Analyses of Variance in Professional and Employee Conception Scale Scores and Their Variances for Patterns of Initiative and Compliance	292

FIGURES

Chapter 2

- | | | |
|------------|--|----|
| Figure 2-1 | The Conceptual Relationships Between Professional-Employee and Local-Cosmopolitan Orientations | 51 |
| Figure 2-2 | Behavioral and Orientation Indices | 54 |

Chapter 3

- | | | |
|------------|--|-----|
| Figure 3-1 | Contrasting Characteristics of Professional and Employee Modes of Organization | 119 |
| Figure 3-2 | Forms of Control and Types of Bureaucracy | 135 |

Chapter 5

- | | | |
|------------|--|-----|
| Figure 5-1 | Description of Subscales for Employee and Professional Scales | 173 |
| Figure 5-2 | Professional and Employee Behavioral Indices | 178 |
| Figure 5-3 | A Typology of Initiative and Compliance | 200 |
| Figure 5-4 | Local-Cosmopolitan Behavioral and Orientation Indices | 204 |
| Figure 5-5 | The Five Most Frequently Mentioned Criticisms that Teachers Have of Their Schools | 208 |
| Figure 5-6 | Classification of the Issues Involved in the 326 Friction Incidents Reported by Teachers | 232 |

Chapter 1

THE PROBLEMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

"The dilemma can be simply stated: Professionals see themselves as persons who are, or ought to be, guided by professional considerations, while in fact they are guided or threatened by superior organizational loyalty."*

This report summarizes the first year of a proposed three-year study of staff conflicts among public school teachers. The theoretical focus of the study is on professionals employed in public bureaucracies of varying size and complexity. The sample for the following phases will include a total of at least twenty more schools.

The primary purpose of this first phase of the project has been to complete the instrumentation for the major variables to be studied in further detail during the next two-year period. Therefore, the major portion of this report will focus on the methodological procedures utilized, data analysis techniques, and the problems encountered in formulating the field work. However, since the utility of these procedures cannot be intelligently assessed apart from the theoretical problems to which they are to be applied, attention will be given to those problems, the literature to which they are related and their implications. Only brief attention will be given in this report to simple, preliminary tests of some of the major hypotheses.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Two types of conflict are to be investigated:

*David N. Solomon, "Professional Persons in Bureaucratic Organizations," Symposium on Preventive and Social Psychiatry (Wash., D.C., Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, 1957), p. 259.

- (1) Episodic and recurrent friction incidents which have recently occurred among teachers and between teachers and their supervisors, as these are described by a sample of teachers in each school.
- (2) Conflicts in conceptions of teachers' professional and employee roles held by teachers in different positions and administrators, as measured by Likert-type role conception scales.

Two current changes in public school teaching make the problem of professional-employee role conflicts and other status anxieties especially relevant there. On the one hand, school systems are growing larger, which increases problems of internal coordination and, in turn, creates greater need for standardization of work, centralization of decisions and other regulations over work; these developments tend to reinforce the traditional image of the teacher as an employee. On the other hand, teachers are professionalizing and developing professional self-conceptions which include competence and license to control their work. These dual perspectives divide teachers from administrators and among themselves.

It is expected that friction incidents and role conflicts are both associated with (a) differences in positions of personnel within the organization, (b) differences in their backgrounds; and that (c) the pattern of conflict is associated with the bureaucratic characteristics of the organization and its community context. Bureaucracy is considered to be a multi-dimensional concept, which will be studied by three separate sets of indicators: (1) specialization, as indicated by the number of independent

positions and the interchangeability of personnel, (2) centralization of authority, as indicated by respondents' reports of the decision-making process on particular issues, (3) standardization of work, based on respondents' perceptions of rules and regulations and system-wide uniformity. In addition, (a) the size of the organization and (b) its economic support will be considered as part of the general context in which the conflicts take place.

PURPOSES OF THE STUDY

The study deals with one of the more significant developments of modern society, the bureaucratization of work, and its effect on the status of professionally oriented personnel employed in these settings. The long-range goal of the research is to contribute to a growing concern about the nature of organizational conflict and to extend sociological theories of complex organization into educational settings. Exploration of questions about the process and content of conflicts and the modes of maintaining them within limits may help to revise the prevalent conception of organizations as essentially stable patterns of events. The study may help to determine whether it is advisable to develop a model of organization which incorporates conflict as a central, inherent process.

One of the specific questions being raised is whether conflict can be explained on the basis of formal and informal organizational structure. While it is commonly assumed that inter-personal conflict is an expression of personality conflicts, the structural factors that encourage and restrain such expressions need to be explained as well. The possibility that conflict and inconsis-

tencies of role conception are associated with organization structure, and with positions of leadership in particular, may be of utility for identifying the potential "sore spots" of organization and for developing strategies to utilize conflict to an organization's advantage.

An attempt has been made to separate the background from the structural aspects of those engaged in conflict. A comparison of these two factors should have implications for the way in which changing the organization and revising hiring policies might modify its incidence and content. Whether background or the authority system, or some combination of each, proves to be more significant explainers of conflict, knowledge about structural strains may be of value to persons engaged in training public school staffs and administrators.

The problem of conflict also has relevance to job commitment and satisfaction, which are likely to be influenced by the frequency of friction within organizations, role conflicts, and their means of resolution. The extent to which an individual receives group support for his point of view, and the general consideration of group cohesiveness, may tend to offset the otherwise negative effects that conflict could have on individuals.

IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVES

Objectives of the Total Project

There are necessarily two levels of objectives: the objectives of the first phase, which this report concerns, pertaining to the instrumentation of the major variables, and those of the total project. The objectives of the total project will be dis-

cussed first. The three-year project has three major related aims:

1. To identify friction incidents:
 - a. Their frequency and recurrence
 - b. Their content
 - c. Their locus within the organization
 - d. Modes of conflict accommodation
2. To explore how friction incidents are associated with professional-employee roles, bureaucratization, formal and informal status within the organization, and staff background.
3. To investigate relationships between conflict and (1) job satisfaction and (2) commitment to the career.

Thesis. It is recognized that personality clashes and emotional disturbances are important sources of certain types of conflict. Similarly, certain characteristics of organization are also associated with conflict. In order to concentrate on the organizational characteristics, the personality variables will not receive attention in this study, although in order to thoroughly understand conflict in organizations, eventually it will be advisable to undertake a study of the joint effects of personality and organizational variables - but only after more is learned about the latter. Learning more about the organizational variables which are relevant to conflict is the limited objective of this study, and it is the guiding consideration of the thesis behind the project.

It is assumed that conflict in schools is a product of normal status striving and status maintenance; that personnel occupy-

ing different positions will have different perspectives and interests; that the pattern and intensity of conflict will depend on relationships between positions in the authority system, the specificity and clarity of roles, interdependence of functions and upon role conceptions. The concept of status, as used here, includes four major dimensions: self-direction, social prestige, economic standing and job security. Conflicts may originate from two general motives, status competition between groups and philosophies, and group resistance to status threatening change. Competition is probably more characteristic of conflict between peers and, probably primarily concerns the division of scarce economic and prestige rewards. They will concern scheduling problems, interruptions of routine, competition for students' time, and the interference of extra curricular activities with the academic program. These conflicts are expected to be inversely associated with the organization's economic resources and with the degree of specialization and departmental autonomy within the organization. Conflict between subordinates and superiors probably takes the form of group resistance against regulations and decisions that infringe on self-direction and threaten job security and prestige. Because administration-teacher conflicts are subject to restraints of the authority system, resistance will normally be reflected in differences in their conceptions of the proper role of the teacher. It is expected that the teacher-administrator conflicts will be relatively frequent, and will primarily concern issues involving the teachers' control over the classroom and their authority within the school. Teacher-administrator conflicts probably will be relatively intense when

they occur because such conflict challenges the entire authority system and is unlikely to occur, without strong peer group support. Such breaches will also divide teachers into pro- and anti-administration camps.

The dimension of self direction, or control over work, will be given special consideration, especially with respect to administration-teacher conflicts. Professional and employee role expectations include this dimension as a basis of differentiation. Wrestling of control from laymen and administration is one of the major impulses behind professionalization. Consequently, it is expected that the balance in professional and employee role conceptions among teachers and between teachers and administrators is associated with overt friction. Since bureaucratization is a system of authority which restrains these conflicts, conflict is expected to be inversely associated with some aspects of bureaucratization. Yet, while logically there would be little conflict in a completely bureaucratized system where teachers accept their employee status, short of that extreme conflict is expected to increase with increases in either (1) professional role conceptions, (2) attempts to centralize control and standardize certain areas of work, and (3) the degree of specialization. More specifically, for a given level of professional role conception, conflict will increase with bureaucratization; for a given level of bureaucracy, conflict will increase directly with professional role conceptions of personnel. At a single point in time, any increase in the professional orientation of teachers or attempts to extend administrative regulations will disturb the balance and precipitate conflict.

Working Hypotheses. The first year is essentially a hypothesis-seeking (rather than a hypothesis-testing), exploratory study; only a small selection of the hypotheses can be tested during the first year, the instrumentation phase. The general working hypotheses that are described below provide initial guidelines for the total study.

I. Teacher-Administrator Conflicts

1. The major issues which create overt friction concern:
 - a. centralized control over the work of teachers and their working conditions.
 - b. "inversions" of the authority system - e.g., where non-supervisory staff personnel (such as attendance takers or janitors), young teachers and outsiders have authority over tenured teachers.
 - c. lack of standardization (rules and policies) - in cases where standardization would provide teachers with equitable treatment and support.
 - d. standardization (rules and policies) - in cases where standardization infringes on teachers' control over the classroom and their authority over "professional" decisions in the school.
2. There is a significant mean difference (and variance) between teachers' and administrators' professional and employee status expectations of teachers.
 - a. These differences increase directly with bureaucratization, as measured in terms of specialization, centralization of authority and standardization of work.
3. The proportion of reported friction incidents (in rela-

tion to staff size) is a function of the equilibrium between professional and employee orientations of teachers, and bureaucratization.

- a. For a given level of professional status orientation (and of employee status orientation), friction is inversely associated with the degree to which the organization is bureaucratized, as measured by specialization, centralization and standardization.
- b. For a given level of bureaucratization (i.e., size, specialization, centralization and standardization considered separately), friction is directly associated with extent and intensity of professional role conception and inversely associated with employee status orientation.
- c. Friction incidents increase as professional conceptions of teachers increase simultaneously with bureaucratization.

II. Teacher-Teacher Conflicts

4. The major issues which create overt friction among peers concern:
 - a. division of responsibility (e.g., teaching loads and scheduling).
 - b. division of economic rewards and facilities (e.g., salary differentials and joint use of such facilities as the gym, auditorium and audio-visual equipment).
 - c. symbols of prestige and influence (e.g., competition for students, and conflicts between unions and professions for teachers' support).

- d. the frequency of such friction is inversely associated with economic support available to the school.
- 5. Conflict is associated with differences in rank between informal and formal positions within the organization.
 - a. the number of friction incidents between two positions is inversely associated with both informal and formal rank differentials between them.
 - b. frequency of friction is associated with the degree to which the positions and those who fulfill them are specialized.
 - c. the differences between the professional and employee status orientations of position incumbents increase directly with both formal and informal rank differentials.
 - d. the rate of conflict in a school is directly associated with differences in professional and in employee status orientations among teachers.

The following rankings will be used in the above hypotheses:

(1) Informal rankings -

- (a) job prestige as rated by peers
- (b) informal leadership as rated by peers
- (c) teaching competence as rated by supervisors
- (d) autonomy of the position and department based on the number of times the administration has been consulted over a prescribed period.

(2) Formal rankings -

- (a) salary (in relation to seniority)
- (b) academic vs. extra curricular teachers

(c) office holders in teachers' unions and professional associations vs administration.

6. Conflict increases with heterogeneity of personnel backgrounds.

a. The proportion of friction incidents is directly associated with:

(1) increases in staff size and personnel turnover rates

(2) heterogeneity of personnel backgrounds, based on a profile of ratios dichotomized on these characteristics of the staff: --

(a) sex

(b) age

(c) marital status

(d) urban-rural background

(e) job mobility

(f) turnover

(g) level of education

(h) local-cosmopolitanism: years in system, residence in county, offices in community organizations, number of systems taught in, location of college attended.

b. Mean differences (and variance) in professional and in employee status conceptions are directly associated with the above background variables and turnover rates.

7. Some of the methods which are frequently used to accommodate or minimize conflict include:

- (a) "buck passing" (i.e., delegation of the problem upward to higher authority and outward to committees)
 - (b) segmentalization of conflict and regrouping for conflict on other issues
 - (c) avoidance of issues
 - (d) formal and implicit reassignments of personnel to minimize interaction after conflict (e.g., work schedules which preclude frequent interaction).
8. Conflict is associated with job satisfaction and career commitment
- a. the frequency of personal involvement in friction is directly associated with intentions to stay in the career (because it is expected that uncommitted personnel will be less concerned with the problems that confront education).
 - b. among persons who become involved in friction episodes between groups, conflict is positively related to job satisfaction (assuming that group support provides a compensatory factor); but for many persons who become involved in personal friction, job satisfaction is inversely associated with the rate and intensity of conflict.

Objectives of the Immediate Study

The objective which is more relevant to the present report is to instrument the major variables included in the foregoing hypotheses. This involves field testing of alternative measures and indices for validity, reliability and efficiency. One of the major problems involves the ways and means of identifying and

classifying both the friction incidents that commonly occur among the teaching staffs of the public schools, and their professional and employee status orientations. It will also be necessary to experiment with a variety of measures of some of the independent variables mentioned above. The specific procedures utilized will be described in detail in Chapters 4 and 5. Before turning to the procedures, however, it will be beneficial to review in some detail the literature relevant to the problem at hand. Attention is turned to that in the following chapter.

Chapter 2

TENSIONS WITHIN ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE-- THE LITERATURE

"If...Utopia...is a product of poetic imagination divorced from the complexities of reality - how is it that so much of recent theory has been based on exactly these assumptions...?"*

Perhaps the statement which opens this chapter overstates the case, in the sense that the facts of conflict cannot be avoided in practice; but until recently, in most of the theoretical models of organization and in the empirical studies these models have guided, conflict has not received the central attention that it deserves. When conflict has been considered in contemporary literature, Coser charges, it has been viewed as a "disease," having primarily "dissociating and dysfunctional consequences" (24). For example, Thompson's recent treatment of organizational conflict, even while recognizing its prevalence, deals primarily with ways of preventing it rather than with its functions (79). Those few contemporary writers who have considered conflict from a functional perspective have usually referred to unique, large scale events, such as war and strikes. Systematic, empirical study of the role of conflict in the daily routine has been relatively ignored.

By contrast, Weber insisted that conflict is integral to social life itself, peace being little more than a change in the form of conflict (82). Simmel proposed that conflict is essential to both the structure and process of group life, and that

*Daerendorf, Ralf, "Out of Utopia: Toward a Reorientation of Sociological Analysis." American Journal of Sociology (Sept. 1958).

groups require disharmony as well as consensus to function effectively: conflict creates groups, provides a bond between opposing groups, provides a safety valve which prevents complete disruption within social structures, and it re-establishes unity (72). Simmel attributed conflict to group characteristics rather than personal hostility, which he believed was the product of conflict rather than its cause. Small, Park, Ross and others also viewed conflict as a central and integrating process (73,64,69). Recently, Dalton, among others, has suggested that it is inherent to leadership positions and a source of flexibility and creativity within organizations (27).

Despite the paucity of systematic empirical analyses of conflict as a central problem, it is, as the early theorists recognized, so basic to the functioning of organizations that certain facts about it could scarcely escape notice. Recently several strands of evidence and thoughts on conflict have begun to emerge. The purpose of this chapter and the following one is to assemble and review two broad classes of literature relevant to the development and process of routine organizational conflicts. After reviewing some general statements and assumptions about organizational conflict, this chapter will outline the literature on (1) a variety of tensions within organizational structure that contribute to conflict, and (2) the theoretical significance of organizational size. The following chapter will review (1) literature on role conflict as it applies to organizations, and (2) the ways in which overt friction incidents have been studied.

GENERAL STATEMENTS

Thompson's "model" for viewing conflict in organizations will

provide an overview of previous thinking on the subject (79). The model (so-called) includes three sources of conflict. First, the fact that technology requires specialization and allocation of resources is a crucial source of conflict. The resulting differentiation and segregated interaction patterns contribute to relative deprivation for some personnel. The effectiveness of organizations demands inequality of members, but authoritarian allocation systems create ideological conflicts over the rights of individuals to receive equal treatment. The problem probably increases directly with size of the organization. Administrators can control this type of conflict somewhat by regulating the division of labor and patterns of interaction. As school systems become larger and more complex, the allocation problems within them may be expected to increase.

Second, according to Thompson's analyses, the "latent roles" of the labor force arising from differences in training, age, religion, sex, and ethnic background create conflicts. In this sense, an organization's vulnerability to conflict depends on how heterogeneous the portion of society is from which the organization recruits. However, in giant organizations where there is a danger of over-emphasizing official norms, and where repeated emphasis on technical or efficiency norms breaks down cooperation and communication, Thompson cautions that failure to activate latent roles also may be a threat (79). Administrators can control this type of conflict by regulating the recruiting process. However, recent increases in heterogeneity of teachers' backgrounds and school size may be expected to contribute to tensions within the schools.

Third, Thompson proposes that a community's heterogeneity is directly associated with internal conflict because heterogeneous communities frequently make conflicting demands on an organization's members. The larger the community and the broader its economic base, the more variable will be the role expectations forced on each position within the organization. The proportion of members exposed to the environment may further influence the extent of conflict. On the other hand, a large or a specialized organization which is located in a homogeneous community also has an unavoidably disruptive role, for according to Thompson, it must differentiate between members drawn from an undifferentiated community and it must recruit outsiders (79). As the school population continues to concentrate in a relatively few metropolitan areas, and as consolidation progresses, the problems stemming from imbalances between homogeneous and heterogeneous populations will grow.

A more specific series of organizational tensions arising from pressures within and upon organizations has been outlined by Gouldner (37). First, the "dual" basis of authority characteristic of most organizations is responsible for some conflict: that is, authority based on technical competence, and authority claimed by sheer incumbency of office. These two bases of authority create line-staff conflicts and tensions between trained specialists and their supervisors, whose training does not qualify them to evaluate the specialists under their supervision. Second, some conflicts arise from necessary compromises between efficiency with expertise. As Gouldner puts it, the pressure which superiors exert for results contrasts with professionals' emphasis on

technical procedure (37). This problem is also complicated by the fact that executives in complex organizations are typically less qualified to judge the specialists below them than are their own subordinates. Third, conflicts develop along generational lines between the new and old organizational elites. Cultural expectations concerning the rights and duties of the young and the old and of males and females also clash with the leveling influence of the official system. Fourth, a dual loyalty is demanded of personnel - to the organization, and to lay and professional audiences outside the organization - which creates cleavages between "locals" and "cosmopolitans." Finally, the autonomy which some members and departments of the organization develop contrasts with their official interdependence.

Homans' model for analyzing social interaction provides a simple means of analyzing structural conflicts, such as those outlined above (47). It utilizes three concepts: interaction, sentiment, and activity. "Activity" refers to the task, or function. "Interaction" may refer either to the volume of interaction or to the status differences between parties who interact. "Sentiment" may either refer to a feeling state (such as hatred), or to overt behavior (such as an argument, making it a form of activity as well). As might be expected, such a simple model needs extension and modification. Homans' model, nevertheless, provides a useful point of departure. In the present study, the main focus will be on the relation between status interaction, function (activity), and conflict.

The popular model which looms in the background of most discussions of bureaucracy is the military establishment, with its

emphasis on compliance and the crucial role of discipline. The image is nurtured by a widely accepted "ideal type" which casts all bureaucratic organizations into one structural form, in which all major decisions are ascribed to central offices and imposed on a disciplined rank-and-file. Such a model is undoubtedly oversimplified. But worse, it is completely misleading in some respects. For example, Gouldner points out that there is not one but at least two bases of bureaucratic authority (38). Some rules are established by agreement, and based on expertise, while others are established by imposition, based on discipline. The first principle employs obedience as a means to an end, while in the second concept, obedience is an end in itself. In the second case the morality and rationality of the order is ignored in favor of the authority of the chief executive. Gouldner concludes that there is not one, but there are two types of bureaucracy which he terms "representative" (based on technically justified rules established by consent) and the "punishment-centered," which poses obedience to rules as the criteria of performance.

Bendix also distinguishes between authoritarian and democratic administration (10). In the former, the employee's obedience is exclusively to his superiors. Because of his obligation to prevailing authority, the employee develops a feeling of solidarity against the public which he confronts as a representative of higher authority rather than as a public employee. Under democratic administration, the official has more authority and his discretion rests on a spirit of public service. His compliance to orders is conditioned by a sense of responsibility to the public. Thus, he is evaluated for his initiative as well as his

compliance. Under this form of organization, public pressures invade all levels of the operation. This distinction has special relevance for the public schools where authority for the school system remains in the centralized office of the superintendent. Under these conditions any attempt to decentralize decision making in order to make the schools more responsive to local school districts is always beclouded by the fact that the main responsibility of school officials is to their administrative superiors rather than to the local public.

In addition to the usual distinctions between representative and authoritarian types of bureaucracies, there are other variations on the bureaucratic model. For example, hospitals quite often deviate from the single chain of command conception of bureaucracy that so many writers seem to think is inherent to bureaucracy. Administrators like to argue that they must have authority for all decisions in order for the organization to function effectively. However, in hospitals there develop what might be called dual lines of authority rather than strictly unitarian ones. There is, in other words, a medical line of authority and a separate administrative line of authority.

Most organizations are probably a compromise of these different types. This element of compromise has built into most organizations ambiguity and uncertainties which contribute to conflict.

Since the crucial characteristic of an authority system is the locus of decision making, it seems useful to study an organization in terms of this characteristic as a means of determining what type of organization it is. For the present study an instrument has been designed which will provide an index of the centralization of the decision making in schools.

SOME PREMISES OF A CONFLICT THEORY

Daerendorf observes that advocates of "empirical research" and defenders of abstract theory are stubbornly similar in one respect (26). They have both dispensed with the prime impulse of all science, the puzzlement over concrete problems, i.e., the simple curiosity to solve the riddles of experience. Problems, as opposed to topics or fields of inquiry, exist because they are puzzling to the investigator. Their solution demonstrates above all, critical examination of facts, observations and testing which generates new problems. He believes that this loss of problem consciousness explains the Utopian state of modern theory.

One of the intriguing areas of life, as all eavesdroppers and gossips know, pertains to the fights and quarrels that arise among individuals and between groups. The question, "What do men fight about?" is one that has also interested historians, novelists and journalists. But, it is not just that conflict is insidiously interesting that makes it important to social scientists. The issues that people fight over in organizations expose the sore points of an organizational society. They reveal the inconsistencies of life that constitute much of its drama, and they suggest what has been left undone in the way of organizing. Thus, a great deal is to be learned about organizations by analyzing what the fighting is all about. For example, do the issues primarily concern personal self interests, and problems that are not directly connected with the organization's problems? Or, are they relevant to the solution of the organization's problems, to increasing its effectiveness? Are the issues generated by "aggressive personalities," or are they expressions of a flexible,

informal organization, and a tension-ridden system? Do the conflicts merely create problems, or do they sometimes solve problems? These are some of the questions which attention to the content of conflict and its antecedents and consequences may help to answer.

However, the problem of conflict touches upon one of the even more fundamental riddles of society - the problem of "social glue," or in other words, what holds organizations together? Why do people join organizations and play roles? If organizations are held together by "morale," harmony and consensus, why do they persist despite the fact of apathy and organized resistance toward official objectives, internal friction, intrinsic competition and sometimes radical cleavages that characterize organizations? It is unreasonable to consider so common an occurrence as conflict as accidental, or exceptional to the "normal" condition of peace. On the contrary, it is not the presence, but the absence of conflict that constitutes the surprising and atypical. What seems to be called for is a model of organization which recognizes that power, and conflict between powers, has as crucial a place in the maintenance of order as does consensus; and that conflict itself, as a natural adjunct of power relationships, can sometimes provide effectiveness and cohesiveness. While the immediate purpose of the present study primarily concerns the antecedents of conflict rather than its consequences, the proposition that conflict is functional will guide some of the hypotheses and conclusions.

Since conflict is to be of primary concern, some of the underlying assumptions about conflict that have implicitly or explicitly

guided the formulation of the hypotheses and directed the research have been outlined below.

The Group Nature of Conflict

Contrary to a popular view, conflict is not purely personal, ~~nor~~ the expression of subjective psychies of individuals. Conflict is a group phenomenon which extends beyond the subjective attitudes of individual group members. Just as a thousand loves between soldiers and enemy women is not equal to peace, says Barnard, so a dozen disputes between American tourists and French cab drivers is not equivalent to a French-American conflict (7). Indeed, Barnard notes, parties in conflict may even display affection toward one another, as in the case of conflict between the sexes or age groups and the numerous wars fought by "peace loving" people. Moreover, as Barnard maintains, improving interpersonal relations by "getting people together" (as in the comprehensive school) does not necessarily reduce conflict; and in cases where enemies have something to fight about, getting them together may simply expose their basic differences and drive them to their extremes. Since conflict can exist independently of personal hostility, personal attitudes reveal little about group relations.

Cultural Relativism

Historically, the "good" people have fought the "good." The neighbors who dispute their property lines are probably "good" citizens. The nations participating on each side in the religious crusades all claimed religious justification. So do modern nations each establish elaborate moral justifications for their acts. That is, the "good" man is generally the supporter of his own groups' values, while the "bad" man is usually on the opposing

side. Thus, the problem is not which side is "good," but what the fight is all about (81).*

Organization as a Balance of Power

What is generally accepted as "good" may have had a long history of struggle for acceptance. Christianity, for example, was at one time the religion of a downcast minority. In this sense, the world, a society, or an organization, as each exists, is the outcome of historical power struggles, and exists under the shadows of remaining animosities. Since the defeat of an idea or a group never implies complete annihilation, history leaves scars which provide the basis for cleavage in new conflicts. For example, the relationship between the North and the South in the United States cannot be understood apart from the Civil War and the events that preceded and followed it. Similarly, playground fights are not always due to "personality" problems; those fighting may represent different groups in conflict, social classes, religious groups and ethnic groups. The fights of children, like the more sophisticated battles among their parents and teachers, often reflect deep-seated animosities that boil from past wounds. Likewise are relationships between the school and its community also cast in terms of struggles now past.

The fact that the established balance of power within organizations is subject to smoldering recurrences of disputes means that there is in all organizations an undercurrent of potential change, compromise and dispute. Complete understanding of the situation requires historical review.

*The writer is indebted to Professor George Vold, whose insightful thinking on this subject is of utmost significance.

Conflict Requires Cooperation

Sociologists early realized that cooperation and conflict are not polar opposites. Rather, conflict between groups promotes cooperation within groups. Because groups need to cooperate in order to wage conflict, the level of cohesiveness and discipline within a group may reflect the disputes that are going on between it and other groups. As new conflicts occur, new forms of cooperation emerge. Thus, competing groups within a school system may nevertheless work together when their mutual interest is jeopardized by outside groups. This alternating current of conflict and cooperation among persons as they identify with different groups provides an element of flux in organizational structures.

Groups Must Be Visible To Wage Conflict

Conflicts cannot occur between groups that are otherwise unidentifiable; that is, each side in a conflict must have some physical, or symbolic identity. The need of groups in conflict to have visible identity explains why minority groups that oppose the established order, such as the Mennonites and more recently the beatniks, deliberately maintain a distinctive appearance. Members of such groups who do not maintain the symbols (such as Mennonites who wear lipstick, Beatniks without beards- and disciples of Dewey who condone educational T.V.), are disclaimed by the other members of the group in order to prevent the destruction of its identity. Often those acts which groups forbid of their members are prohibited because the acts blur the group's identity rather than because they are mortal sins. For example, although one branch of Mennonites is not permitted to have telephones in their homes, they freely use public

telephone booths on the streets where they will not be identified with them. Conversely, as groups in conflict lose their characteristic identity, the conflict between them declines; groups such as Negroes, which cannot modify their appearance, must endure conflict longer than other ethnic groups, many of which have become almost completely acculturated and accepted. It is probably typical of conflicts to disappear in this way, without being resolved.

The highest expression of a group's identity is its ideology. Its ideology justifies its position in conflict. For example, each side of the "town and gown" fights between colleges and their communities has its rationale and its justification. Professors are viewed by a nation that historically has been grossly anti-intellectual simultaneously as potentially dangerous liberals, and as impractical partially useless curiosities; while professors develop strong ideologies about laymen as "crass materialists" or conservative and unsophisticated stogies. As professors are able to demonstrate their utility and conservatism to every group that demands it, the gown-town conflicts will diminish, as will the traditional identity of many professors. In the public schools, the ideology of local democratic control over the schools bolsters local resistance to consolidation and to interference from State Departments of Education, while State Departments justify their interference on the basis of ideologies about raising the standards of education, benevolence and professional expertise. One of the major ideological disputes in education concerns the issue of academic achievement versus equal opportunity to be educated; each

side develops arguments which support either the upper class or the middle class position in the conflict (21,63).

Conflict Influences Goals

Because conflict within and between organizations is a normal condition, different personnel develop objectives which are at odds and not expressed in official statements of purposes. This situation leads to diversity of organizational goals and unplanned cleavages between departments which further compromises the original goals. The operating goals are, consequently, partly forged out of the conflict process.

Implications

The conflict model is perhaps over-occupied with these spontaneous conflicts and the emergence of unplanned goals, as Gouldner has suggested, but the preoccupation is a welcome contrast to the logical-rational model of organization which precludes systematic recognition of goal conflicts (37).

The fundamental question at this point is not whether the rational or conflict model is more "real to life," but which raises the more significant questions. In the conflict model, organization is problematic. The model calls for an investigation of organization as an initially "unnatural" state of affairs. It implies the question: What causes organization? Answers to this question in turn have implications for the roles of teachers and of school administrators.

CONDITIONS WHICH CREATE CONFLICTS BETWEEN INDIVIDUALS

March and Simon define conflict as a "breakdown in the standard mechanisms of decision-making so that an individual or group exercises difficulty in selecting an action alternative." (59).

They identify three main classes of conflict: (1) individual conflict (i.e., conflict in individual decision-making); (2) organizational conflict (i.e., individual or group conflict within organizations); and (3) intra-organizational conflict (i.e., conflict between organizations or groups). The focus of the following discussion will be on the first two classes.

While most of the significant conflicts involve groups, disputes that primarily concern individuals do occur under certain circumstances. While many of these undoubtedly originate from "personality clashes," conflicts involving individuals are also generated and sustained by certain features of organizations. March and Simon identify three such sources of individual conflict: (1) uncertainty of alternatives, (2) lack of preference for an alternative, and (3) unacceptability of known alternatives (59).

Uncertainty of Alternatives

They advance two hypotheses about uncertainty(59). First, the greater the amount of past experience that all parties have had with a decision situation, the less probable that intra-individual conflict will arise. Thus, conflict in recently created schools is expected to be higher than in long established schools. For similar reasons, conflict due to uncertainty is more likely to involve newer teachers than teachers with more seniority. As a corollary, the higher the proportion of new teachers and administrators, the higher is the probability of general confusion about what alternatives are available. For similar reasons, the likelihood of conflict from uncertainty (and unacceptability) of alternatives increases with increases in turnover and inter-departmental transfer rates. However,

some of the effects of turnover are apparently automatically compensated for by certain principles of organization. Gouldner reports that when there is a turnover of leadership, bureaucratic procedures are instituted which help to offset conflict from this source (38).

A second hypothesis which March and Simon advance is that the less complex the decision situation, the less probable that intra-individual conflict will arise (59). Conflict from this source is, for example, more likely to arise in schools upon the introduction of a new course into the curriculum than when annual teaching assignments are being made. To a certain extent, of course, the seeming complexity of a decision can be offset by greater experience with it (the first hypothesis). It is, in fact, interesting to speculate on the interrelation between these two variables. A new teacher facing a principal who is in his 15th year on the job with respect to a complex decision (whether to teach religion in class, for example), would provide an extreme situation. The school and the principal have had past experience, but the decision is relatively difficult, and one party is new, which creates an element of uncertainty. Whether or not conflict ensues will depend on the intensity of the expectations of the new member. By contrast, a new principal facing a new staff might expect to experience conflict over even relatively simple decisions.

Acceptability of Alternatives

Whether or not the available alternatives are acceptable to each party depends on the existing relationship between (a) their personal backgrounds, and (b) the present situation. March and Simon hypothesize: "The greater the disparity between aspiration

levels and achievement, the higher the probability of individual conflict within the organization" (59). Thus, extremely ambitious recruits may be a source of precipitant conflict. Similarly, changes in achievement opportunity can influence conflict. Sudden changes in the immediate situation or the general environment, such as a business recession, a tax reduction, a population explosion, social class transitions in a particular neighborhood, or other changes, would reduce the amount of economic support in relation to existing expectations and thus precipitate conflict.

March and Simon propose that conflict may even increase in a steadily improving situation if the growing aspiration level of the workers exceeds the gains they achieve. This would help to explain the publicized dissatisfaction of teachers with their salaries despite recent impressive salary improvements in most parts of the country: professionalization has stimulated growing salary ambitions and a general discontent with much of the present. The administration will often stress recent progress that has been made within the profession, while younger teachers have in mind the more impressive improvements that have been made in other schools or in other fields to which their own expectations are still tied.

INTERGROUP CONFLICT WITHIN ORGANIZATION

Most recurrent conflicts between individuals eventually call for allies. There is, therefore, a natural tendency for inter-personal conflicts to evolve into conflict between groups.

The conditions mentioned above are sufficient to produce conflict between groups as well as between individuals, but they are not necessary for intergroup conflict. March and Simon list

three conditions which do seem to be necessary for conflict to develop between groups or organizations: (1) interdependence (i.e., the existence of a positive felt need for joint-decision-making), and either (2) differences in group goals, or (3) differences in group expectations or definitions of reality (59).

Interdependence

Interdependence in organization takes two major forms, each of which creates problems: personnel must share certain resources, and their work must be coordinated. March and Simon hypothesize that the need for joint-decision-making is highest when the entire organization depends on a single, limited resource (59). Mutual dependence on limited resources increases allocation problems and produces jealousies among departments and agencies competing for resources. For example, conflicts among school principals are expected to be frequent where the schools are supported by a single tax resource, but these conflicts will diminish as the economic wealth of the area increases (assuming constant levels of aspiration). Sudden increases in the resources of a system, however (as when it receives increases in Federal or State Aid), may increase temporary conflict over the distribution of new resources.

To the extent that single salary schedules reduce the number of decisions pertaining to allocation, internal conflicts that otherwise arise from allocation problems are reduced; conflicts between high school and elementary teachers, and teachers of different subjects are expected to be lower in districts which use single salary schedules than those few districts which do not. Although, to the extent that single salary schedules aggravate

the felt discrepancy between competence and recognition, they merely re-group the disputants (perhaps along local-cosmopolitan lines and varying degrees of professionalism).

Students constitute one of teachers' major resources. There will probably be less trouble among teachers of required courses than among teachers who must compete with one another for student enrollment. The level of incipient conflict will rise whenever a department attempts to increase its offerings, and especially when it seeks "required" status for a course. However, perhaps the most salient conflicts between teachers for students occur in the unregulated areas of "participation in" extra curricular activities.

Interdependence of activities also increases scheduling problems and encourages the "participant to control the allocation of resources and the timing of activities that impinge on his own" (59). Persons who teach different sections of the same course will tend to compete for favorable hours and for better students. Also, as more high school graduates attend college, the dependence of public school administrators on college officials will increase, as will the struggle of college professors to influence the high school curriculum. Similarly, the probability of conflict between two types of teachers is greater where one teacher teaches a prerequisite for the other's course than between teachers with semi-independent courses which are not part of the general sequence. Further, the adjacent parties in a sequence of interdependent activities are probably more likely to experience conflict than non-adjacent parties. For example, sixth grade and seventh grade teachers can probably find more to fight about than either can find to fight about with 12th grade teachers.

As a general principle, conflict is a function of the number of interdependent "connections" between the different units of an organization; thus, straight-line hierarchical organizations are less subject to conflict than more "circular" types of decision arrangements where a number of units must be involved and coordinated (83). In seeking to increase the participation of all units ("connections") in decision-making, "democratic" organizations are prone to conflict.

Division of Labor. Divisions of labor, in particular, create tensions, and they are probably as important as the more publicized hierarchical problems. In fact, Landsberger charges that attention to the vertical dimension of authority in organizations has obscured the important role that horizontal authority plays in the solution of problems arising from the division of labor (52). He suggests that the rate of conflict is due to the rate of interdependence of the activities of those involved. Thus, research and purchasing will probably clash less frequently than research and production departments since the former groups usually are not as interdependent on one another. In his research he found that equivalent departments in different organizations take the same position in controversies. This suggests that the conflicts are not due to the personalities of those involved; rather they are due to the objective existence of dilemmas for persons in certain positions. He concludes that many conflicts, as well as forms of cooperation arise from subordinates' interests in solving the organization's problems rather than out of selfishness or sheer emotion.

The clarity of certain divisions of labor was found by Ford and Stephenson to be inversely related to the size of the hospitals

they studied and directly related to the degree of tension among co-workers (33). Henry discusses the clarity of the division of labor in terms of "functional overlap" (45). He proposes that the tension between departments is directly proportional to their power and to the degree of functional overlap between them; the stress for an individual is directly proportional to the number and consistency of commands which he receives and to the number of his superiors; breaking the chain of command is directly related to tension within the system.

Chapple and Sayles describe an example of the influence that structural inconsistencies have on the perceptions of those located in different positions within the organization (16). In a manufacturing company, the sales and credit managers were often at odds with one another. Their supervisors first looked for the explanation in their personalities, but upon examination they seemed normal; so the supervisors were forced to look at the workflow. They found that because orders were first processed through the sales department before going to the credit department for a check of credit rating, customers were receiving notice of shipments before the credit department returned the sales slip with insufficient credit. When the work-flow was reversed, it eliminated the conflict which management originally had attributed to incompatible personalities.

Crozier enumerates several conflicts in an industrial organization that he studied, all of which could be attributed to the division of labor (25). He found existing conflict between the comptroller and the director because the comptroller was able to check on the director in signing all important papers.

Furthermore, there was a conflict between the assistant director and the director in terms of the problem of younger generations being a threat to the older generation. Opposition between maintenance and production personnel constituted one of the main conflicts.

The division of labor between "line" and "staff" personnel accounts for some of the major recurrent conflicts in many types of organizations. Parrow makes a different but parallel distinction between personnel engaged in the "intrinsic" and the "extrinsic" functions, which in the schools is roughly equivalent to the distinction between "academic" and "extra curricular" activities (66).

Janowitz notes how changing discipline and previous military experience creates strains between line and staff personnel in the Army (50). But Dalton's studies of line and staff relationships in three industrial plants especially illuminate the kind of friction typical of this type of division of labor (27). Dalton suggests that while it is the function of specialists to criticize and innovate, there is little in the structure of organizations that encourages it. Attempts of specialties to win legitimate authority tend to be resisted by the hierarchy because the "idea man" threatens status and power, as Thompson observes (80). Thus, conflicts between the role of the specialist and the definition of "success" as hierarchical assendency are prevalent.

Staff-line relationships are generally based on the assumptions that: (1) the staff is content to function without authority over the line; (2) contributions of the staff will be wel-

comed by the line; and (3) contributions of the staff will be accepted by the line. However, the actual relationship between staff and line reported by Dalton was often quite the opposite of these formal conditions (27). Staff and line personnel were separated by several tension producing cultural factors. For example, the staff men and line men were of noticeably different ages; staff men were younger, and displayed conspicuous ambition. Probably they were less secure and less resigned in their present status. This age difference was also responsible for a disparity between the social status and the official rank of line and staff officers. Older line officers were embarrassed to receive instructions (which often appeared as orders) from the younger, less experienced staff, and to compensate for their embarrassment they would receive staff ideas with exaggerated amusement.

Since there were fewer levels of hierarchy in the staff sections, chances of the staff for advancement were systematically restricted, but they could increase their sphere of authority by increasing the number of subordinates under their direction, and by gaining power over the line. Partially this was one reason that staff departments increased at a faster rate than did line departments. This tendency for staff budgets to increase at a faster rate than line budgets seems to be a general characteristic of modern large-scale organization. One satirist claimed that the number of admiralty officers and dock officers in the British Admiralty increased 78 per cent and 40 per cent respectively while the number of ships in commission declined at nearly the same rate(65). Similarly, while the expenditures for administering public schools remained relatively constant from 1929 to

1952 (fluctuating between 3.5 and 4.5 of the total expenditures), auxiliary staff services increased from 4.4 per cent to 7.8 per cent over the same period.

The line and staff also frequently differ in formal education. Dalton found that a high proportion of staff personnel were college graduates who had little direct work experience (27). While at college they had not foreseen the resistance they were to encounter. Once on the job they soon learned that, while they had been prepared to fill their logical role, their freedom to work was restricted by a complex of informal snares to which they had to defer if their ideas were to be accepted at all. Those who did adapt to the informal organization found a comfortable niche for themselves, but they did not contribute much. Those who did not adapt left, which produced a high turnover rate among staff officers.

Besides age and educational differences, staff-line relations were aggravated by the competitive natures of their formal offices. Since they were the official agents of top management and were well educated, the staff felt somewhat superior to line officers. More important, their chief means of advancement involved criticizing the line officers' work. Line officers naturally resented being criticized by the staff; suggested revisions implied that the line men have been stupidly wrong all these years. On the other hand, because top line officers did have some authority to evaluate staff officers who were being considered for advancement, the staff was cautious about pressing the ideas to which they were opposed. Anyway, it was relatively simple for line officers to sabotage proposals to which they were

privately opposed, even though they could be forced by their superior officers to adopt them. Confronted with this official and informal power of line officers, the staff often compromised their own position by cooperating with the line in evading rules in order to secure their cooperation informally. Such compromises among line and staff in school systems are not widely publicized, but undoubtedly occur. For example, in at least one lower class school known to the author, teachers apparently covertly collaborated with the attendance office to conceal from the State Department of Education the large number of unexcused absences which the truant officer was unable to control. A system of "careless" attendance taking characterized the entire school.

Differences in Group Goals

Conflict is likely to increase with the number of organizational goals and their abstractness. Goals so vague that operating policy only can be hammered out of daily short-run decision-making problems are typical of education; to "educate the child" and to "prepare for citizenship" are hardly directives for action. As a result, the ideal goals are compromised and the school loses long-range direction.

The existence of large numbers of goals function in the same way as the diffuseness of any one of them might function, to create conflict. Charged with dozens of goals, all presumably of equal importance and often logically or physically inconsistent during the time available, teachers necessarily dispute over their priority in the day-to-day operation of the school. In different positions, under different pressures, teaching different types of students, various teachers naturally emphasize different

goals and criticize each other's neglect of their own preference. Some teachers emphasize the middle or the lower class problems, others the problems of bright students, or of the slow learners; they differ over the place of the classics, extra-curricular activities, and of a college preparatory curriculum. Without violating the child's integrity, teachers are expected to make lower-class children better middle-class citizens, but according to most, not at the expense of the middle-class, college-bound student who needs an academic environment; and none of these functions is to be slighted. It is probable that the goals which define the school administrator's task are numerically even greater. Applying this analysis to particular schools, it may be expected that the more concrete and manageable the goals, and the more consensus on their priority (relative to the facilities available), the lower will be the probability of conflict.

From the traditions and recent experiences of public education in American society two contrasting images of teachers have crystalized that will determine the goals which educators will set for themselves in the near future: subserviance to laymen and the administration, and professionalism. On the one hand, there is a strong tradition of local, lay control over educators; as school systems grow more complex, administrative control over teachers is necessarily increased in order to maintain internal coordination. On the other hand, educators are professionalizing, fashioning for themselves professional self-conceptions of competence and license to control their work. This dual image divides teachers and administrators among themselves in terms of employee and professional role conceptions, conceptions which provide alter-

nate directions in which teaching and administration may develop in the near future.

The bureaucratic image of teaching points in one direction. Dimock defines bureaucracy as a way of life in which institutions overshadow individuals (90). Many of the educational issues of the day, such as educational T.V., the growth of required courses, and large class size concern the presumed effects of standardization and centralization on education. The specific issues surrounding standardization include the importance of course guides, the appropriateness of required courses, the proper number and specificity of rules and job descriptions governing classroom routines and teachers' authority within the school, the desirability of ~~state-wide~~ adoptions of texts and courses of study, rigidity of job descriptions, the appropriateness of various official sanctions, the feasibility of certain teaching methods, and pressures to cover prescribed dosages of material. Despite ideologies of individual attention, there are salient pressures to justify standardization: high student mobility and teacher turnover rates which necessitate uniformity of curriculum requirements and comparability of methods; and a promotion system which requires uniformity in order to articulate grade levels. Conant's proposal to require a standard curriculum compulsory for all "talented" youth reflects the times (20).

While there is not a consistent relationship, centralization often implies an increase in both the scope and size of the public school system. The increasing scope of education raises questions about the proper authority and influence of State Departments of Education, the effects of state and federal legis-

lation on the curriculum and on school policies, and which administrative level is to be ultimately responsible for educational leadership. The evolving magnitude of education also has created considerable variability in the size of the nation's schools. The number of the smallest school districts decreased by one-half between 1947 and 1959. Despite the many small schools that persist, the trend is toward volume as the population explodes and concentrates in metropolitan areas. Currently, 20 per cent of the nation's schools educate 80 per cent of its children. Besides the population growth, the impetus to centralize has originated from the cold war and consequent increases in the scope of curriculum offerings and public pressures to raise educational standards uniformly. Conant proposes a minimum school size which exceeds the present mean size, and Mr. Eurich of the Ford Foundation suggests that the traditional ideas about the effectiveness of small classes are out of date (32).

In other words, it is not only individual students but teachers who are over-shadowed by the bureaucratic image. The growth of bureaucracy increases the problems of internal coordination, which are "solved" by more standardization of work, centralization of the major decisions and a proliferation of regulations over work. As a result, it requires more education and technical skill to manage the operation and the status of administrators is elevated, which in turn reinforces the traditional image of teachers and lower echelon administrators as employees of local communities, thus removing from them much of the opportunity to control their work.

The professional image points teaching in quite another

direction, however. Behind professionalization is a "drive for status," which invariably means that members of a vocation seek more control over their work; professional associations were originally formed to wrest the control of certain vocations from the state (61,67). The efforts of teachers to professionalize are no exception - professionalization challenges the traditional ideologies of local control by laymen and by their hired professional administrators. Teachers as a group, however, are also ambivalent toward increasing their authority over the curriculum, the choice of their teaching methods and the selection of their own materials. On the one hand, they invite lay committees to choose the means of reporting grades, to regulate the disciplining of students, and to determine the proper amount of homework; but on the other hand, they resent and resist "outside" influence from laymen and control from above, the administration. The immediate issues concern the amount of autonomy that should be granted to local boards of education, to administration, and to teaching professions. But the underlying issues are not peculiar to teaching; they pertain to the appropriate role of the professional-employee in complex organizations and to the place of experts in a democracy.

The goals that these images imply become translated into professional and bureaucratic conceptions of specific work roles which employees in the government, military, educational, business, medical and social welfare agencies hold simultaneously only with great difficulty. These role conflicts will be considered in the following chapter.

Group Consensus

Whether or not there is consensus on certain goals, whatever their number and diffuseness is an independent problem. The answer depends partly on (a) the recruitment process, (b) patterns of turnover, and (c) interaction patterns within the organization.

Recruitment

The potential for conflict probably diminishes to the extent that personnel are drawn from the same background source - a preferred teachers' college, a specific regional background (from the South or from small towns), a specific sex, religion, ethnic and socio-economic background. As Becker and Geer put it, people take culture with them (9). As specialization increases within a school, conflict among personnel with different specialties can be expected to increase. The significance of these background differences fluctuates with the prevalence of broader institutional conflicts and changes in the society, and with the consistency of all major institutional values. For example, as immigration diminishes, ethnicity is likely to become less of a problem in most of the nation's schools. Similarly, local-cosmopolitan and rural-urban conflicts will probably diminish as the American society settles on a dominating mass, national character.

The effects of the differences among the backgrounds in the organization have been reported by a number of observers. Hughes laments a contradiction between industry's complaint about the lack of ambition and its complaint that certain persons (i.e., those of minority status) have too much of it (48). Collins reports that ethnic background has a decided influence on promotion

patterns(19). Whyte's study of the restaurant industry illustrates the effect that the relationship between the sexes has on behavior in organizations (83). He found that counter-men resented receiving orders from waitresses and so devised impersonal means by which they could regulate their own work and avoid taking direct orders from women.

Becker and Geer speak of the effects of these backgrounds as the "latent culture" of the organization which is part of neither the formal nor the informal roles of the organizational structure itself. They propose that the effect that latent culture has on the work norms increases directly with the homogeneity of the group. But they also recognize that if latent culture can restrict the manifest organizational structure, the organizational structure can in turn restrict the effect of the latent culture. Thus, they propose that the latent culture operates in areas that are less crucial for the organization and which are not covered by the formal and informal structural roles (9).

The stage of recruitment is the point at which the latent culture takes form. Argyris found that the hiring procedure of a bank led to the selection of a particular type of employee - namely, persons who possess a strong desire for economic security and job stability, a desire to be left alone, and a dislike of aggressiveness in themselves or in others (4). While this type of employees were well suited for performing the routine work of the bank, they made poor supervisors when promoted because the qualities that made them good subordinates made them passive and weak leaders, which thus impaired the efficiency of the organization.

The recruiting process is so important that major alterations are sometimes made in organizations in order to alleviate some of the strains which competitive recruiting for "desirables" entails. Smigel reports that because of increasing competition for lawyers, law firms have adapted to the competition for recruits in two ways: (1) firms won't "pirate" an employee from another firm, and (2) there's a gentleman's agreement to pay the same beginning salaries (74). Other changes include hiring partners to do recruiting, trying to lure potential partners when they are students, creating illusory titles to make people think they are moving up faster than they are, reducing nepotism and invoking and "up or out" rule. Because of the increased time recruiting takes, managerial duties have been imposed on lawyers and law firms have become more bureaucratic and formal in the process of competing for new lawyers.

Locals and Cosmopolitans. The utility of categorizing recruits as locals or cosmopolitans on the bases of their backgrounds has encouraging support reported in studies by Merton, Gouldner, and Rossi (37,62,70). The local is primarily preoccupied with the problems and interests of either the local community or the local organization that employs him, while the cosmopolitan is chiefly concerned with the world outside the local community and/or organization. In this sense, the local is parochial while the cosmopolitan is ecuminical. The local finds his reference group within the community or organization, while the cosmopolitan's reference groups lie outside of the community or the organization. Merton's study of the differences between local and cosmopolitan leaders' use of the mass media is illustrative (62). He found

that cosmopolitan leaders merely reside in the local community; they live predominantly in the national and international cultural medieval period. For example, most cosmopolitans say they worry about world news; they have been more mobile, and they are typically recent arrivals. By contrast, only a small percentage of locals worry about world news; they are likely to have lived in the community for a long period and do not wish to move.

Gouldner's study of the faculty of a small liberal arts college extends the local-cosmopolitan typology into the sphere of organization (37). It was found that cosmopolitans were (a) low on loyalty to the employing organization, (b) high on commitment to skills, and that (c) they used an "outer" reference group. The locals displayed the reverse characteristics. (However, by including "commitment to skills" with the other two criteria, Gouldner seems to have fused the concept of cosmopolitanism with professionalism.)

Four types of locals and two types of cosmopolitans were identified by factor analysis. Of the locals, these were first the "dedicated" locals, i.e., those loyal to the community and to the traditions of the college. They believed that it was more important for their colleagues to be loyal to the college than to have a high level of skill. Secondly, the "true" bureaucrat was concerned primarily about criteria that outsiders used to judge the college and public relations. The "home guard" type of local, who had lived in the community before he had been employed in the school, was quite often found among the administration. Finally, the "elders" were locals who had the longest tenure and who evaluated their colleagues and the school in terms of the past.

Among the cosmopolitans, some were "outsiders" who would leave if they had a better offer, and who complained about pressures to participate in community activities. On the other hand, "empire builders" were cosmopolitans who were primarily loyal to their own departments and wanted more autonomy from the administration and the community.

From the study Gouldner reports several major findings. Compared with locals, cosmopolitans desired lighter teaching loads in order to do research and to write; they found fewer persons in the college with whom to share professional interests; they published more; they would more readily leave the college; they knew fewer faculty members, were less opposed to AAUP intervention in the college affairs, received more intellectual stimulation from sources outside the college, and they considered salaries to be low (37).

Along the same lines of inquiry, Lazarsfeld and Theilens found that a social science professor who is loyal to his college tends to be conservative, while the academic oriented professor tends to be permissive (54). The permissive professor is willing to explore unorthodox ideas and is more likely to have achieved professional distinction in social science. However, these professors were more apprehensive in the face of the community pressures for conformity.

Gottlieb classified graduate students as locals and cosmopolitans on the basis of the following question: "In the long run would you rather be known and respected (a) throughout the institution where you work or (b) among specialists in your field in different institutions?"(36). "Research-oriented" graduate students fell disproportionately into the cosmopolitan classifica-

tion while "teaching-oriented" students fell into the local group.

This dichotomy between locals and cosmopolitans is probably particularly important in explaining consensus and differences of opinion in the public schools. Gross found that provincialism (localism) and traditionalism were frequent complaints that public school superintendents expressed about their faculties and their communities (40). Wayne Gordon found that the longer a teacher worked in the community the more likely he was to accept the social class controls of the community in assigning the rewards and punishment in the classroom (35). Carlson's study, noted below, provides further evidence of the relevance of this distinction in the public schools (15).

Suttoff reports a study completed recently at Stanford University in which six forms of participation in school affairs (other than voting and organizational membership) were identified and measured and then related to participants' orientations toward the local community (75). Cosmopolitans were identified as persons who tended to move to their present address from outside the communities, while locals were less mobile. Locals had less formal education, particularly beyond college; they held fewer professional positions; they held fewer organizational memberships; they belonged to more service clubs, but to fewer professional organizations and hobby groups; they participated less in children's organizations, such as Boy Scouts, Campfire Girls, etc.; they subscribed to fewer news and opinion magazines and to fewer daily newspapers published outside of the community; and as PTA members, they were more likely to have read the statewide Parent-Teachers Magazine and less likely to have read the National Parent-Teachers Magazine.

It was found that locals showed greater loyalty and organizational activity within the PTA than did cosmopolitans, who were less inclined to feel close attachment to local institutions, but who did show interest in school affairs by reading and talking about them. Both locals and cosmopolitans were active in the PTA, but locals held more offices and committee memberships. Locals tended to belong to service clubs, while cosmopolitans tended to belong to professional associations. Locals read the local press and tended to ignore national magazines, while cosmopolitans subscribed to daily newspapers published in metropolitan areas and subscribed to national opinion magazines.

Suttoff concludes that the school administrator must appeal to two audiences which frequently hold conflicting values and interests. He correctly concludes that locally and cosmopolitan-oriented citizens would judge policies of local schools on different standards. The local would judge the school program on the basis of its conformity to commonly accepted standards and values of the community, being suspicious of outside influences. The cosmopolitan layman, on the other hand, would ask whether the educational program is in line with national trends. The inconsistencies of these views would become apparent in hiring new teachers, assessing the qualifications of teachers, and in setting expectations of how much "service" teachers were supposed to render to the local community.

Conceptualizing the Local-Cosmopolitan and Professional-Employee Typologies. However, while the distinction between

"locals" and "cosmopolitans" promises to be an important theoretical point of departure for the study of social life, these concepts are

admittedly still gross in definition and crude in application. The concepts have been defined so extensively, i.e., including such a variety of behavior, that there is little left for hypotheses. So much meaning has been packed into the definitions, in fact, that the researcher has a difficult time in distinguishing between the way the concept has been logically defined and what it is supposed to be empirically associated with. Another, and one of the most confusing problems is how the concepts of "local" and "cosmopolitan" are connected with the concepts "professional" and "employee." While the problems of professional employees will be discussed in the chapter which follows, it is advisable to work out the logical connection between these variables at this point before proceeding to that analysis.

Undoubtedly, both of the problems mentioned above are compounded by the failure of writers to distinguish between three types of data: value orientations toward a specific set of standards, types of reference groups, and observable behavior. For both sets of concepts (i.e., local-cosmopolitan and professional-employee), it is well to maintain this distinction between orientation and behavior, for they may not be empirically correlated. In this report the convention will be adopted of referring to local and cosmopolitan orientations as types of reference groups; a cosmopolitan orientation will apply to persons or groups who look to standards held by groups outside of the local organization or community for guides to action and self evaluation, while a local orientation, on the other hand, will apply to persons who identify with standards held by persons or groups within the local organization or community. Professional and employee orientations will

refer to a more specific set of standards maintained by professional associations. That is, unlike local-cosmopolitan orientation which can be established very simply by whether or not a party subscribes to an outside reference group, the professional orientation requires more refined analysis to determine whether or not that outside reference group implies subscription to a specific set of norms sanctioned by an association of professional colleagues; and an employee orientation entails identification with the authority of local administrators and laymen.

Figure 2-1 outlines the logical relationships between the cosmopolitan-local and the professional-employee orientations. The positive cells indicate whether either the cosmopolitan or the local orientation includes professional or employee orientations listed in the left hand column. The null cells indicate that either the professional or the employee orientation is excluded by the definition of local or cosmopolitan.

Figure 2-1
THE CONCEPTUAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PROFESSIONAL -
EMPLOYEE AND LOCAL - COSMOPOLITAN ORIENTATIONS

	Cosmopolitan Orientation	Local Orientation
Professional Orientation	+	+
Employee Orientation	-	+
Other types of Orientation	+	+

+ Included with cosmopolitan or local conceptualization

- Excluded from cosmopolitan or local conceptualization

The table portrays several basic characteristics of the variables. First, the local-cosmopolitan concepts are more inclusive than the professional-employee ones, which apply to a limited area of occupational problems. Both the local and the cosmopolitan concepts include orientations other than either professional or employee ones. A cosmopolitan, for example, might rely on national clubs, opinion leaders or national news magazines, none of which is strictly connected with professionalism. Similarly, a local might be oriented to civic groups and activities which are irrelevant to professional-employee problems. Thus, the cosmopolitan orientation includes the professional one, and it does not normally include purely employee orientations (except to the extent that employees identify with the federal government or other lay groups outside of the community who may control his salary or when he identifies with a cosmopolitan oriented associate), but the cosmopolitan orientation encompasses other orientations as well; professional orientations on the other hand consist of a specific set of standards.

Similarly, local orientations include other orientations as well as employee orientations. Moreover, it is logically possible for a locally oriented person to be a "poor" employee, not in the sense that he is preoccupied with local, and parochial problems, but in the sense that this preoccupation may lead him into conflict with the present administration, especially if the present administration were cosmopolitan in its orientation.

Finally, while professionally oriented groups may hold cosmopolitan orientations (i.e., pointed to professionals in other organizations), professionals are also sometimes locally oriented

only to their professional colleagues exclusively within their own organization (11).

Turning from the matter of orientation to the behavior of these four categories of people, the cosmopolitan may be identified as one who has had experience in, or who operates in, a variety of locales and settings and is not strongly affiliated with his present community or job. The local, on the other hand, has had less variety of experience in other locations and is strongly committed to his present location.

The professional may be identified by his compliance with specific professional standards, such as continuing his professional education, and participating in and contributing to professional activities. The employee demonstrates his loyalty to the present administration and displays devotion to the organization in which he works. General and specific indices of each of these variables are listed in Figure 2-2.

Turnover

The phase of recruiting just discussed is part of the total process of turnover in organizations, which has extreme relevance for the degree of consensus which organizations can maintain. Gouldner finds that the turnover of leadership is related to the institution of bureaucratic procedures (37).

Levenson maintains that the succession of leaders is related to the effectiveness of organizations (56). For example, the leader who is under consideration for promotion, striving to gain favorable recognition, tends to enforce rules more strictly than before he was considered. Larger organizations, concludes Levenson, not only permit more turnover because they are more bureaucratized and impersonal, but they demand more turnover to permit flexibility.

However, different types of leaders have different effects as they assume and shed their positions. Carlson reports that the patterns of leadership are especially different among locals (or "place-bound") and cosmopolitan (or "career-bound") superintendents

Figure 2-2

BEHAVIORAL INDICES

<u>Type of Variable*</u>	<u>General Class</u>	<u>Specific Measure</u>
Professional	Development of Professional skills (knowledge)	Type of Training Years of Education Subscription to Professional Journals Time Devoted to Reading
	Participation in professional activities	Commitment to Teaching Publishing Articles Active in Professional Associations
Employee	Loyalty to administration	Loyalty as Evaluated by the Principal Uncritical of the Administration
	Loyalty to Organization	Number of days absent Uncritical of Organization
Local-Cosmopolitan	Affiliation with local institutions in the community	Total Number of Years in System Previous Residence in the County Where Now Teaching Held Office in a Community Organization
	Experience with other systems and regions	Total Number of Systems in Which Taught Crossed State Lines to go to college

Figure 2-2, con't.
ORIENTATION INDICES

<u>Type of Variable*</u>	<u>General Class</u>	<u>Specific Measure</u>
Professional	Orientation to Clients	See scale items
	Orientation to Colleagues	See scale items
	Emphasis on Monopoly of knowledge	See scale items
	Emphasis on decision making authority	See scale items
Employee	Loyalty to administration	See scale items
	Loyalty to organization	See scale items
	Experience	See scale items
	Interchangeability of Personnel	See scale items
	Emphasis on Rules & Procedures	See scale items
	Sensitivity to Public Opinion	See scale items
Local-Cosmopolitan	Ref. Group in system or community	Assume that there is a disagreement in the school district about whether to build a new school especially to accommodate the mentally gifted children in the system. Please rate in importance the 1st & 2nd individuals or groups whom you feel would be most important to you for guidance in making up your own mind:
	Ref. group outside system or community	
		Local - - *
		Cosmopolitan - - **

*In this report, the Professional and employee concepts will be treated as separate variables, while, for the moment, the local and cosmopolitan concepts will be treated as dichotomies as they usually have been treated in the literature.

*Local -- teachers in the school, the superintendent, principal, school board or parents' groups.

**Cosmopolitan -- teachers' associations, participants in professional conferences and workshops, university professors, U.S. Office of Education.

(15). Place-bound superintendents are insiders promoted from within the system; they constituted 35 per cent of the nationwide sample of 859 superintendents. Career-bound superintendents came in from the outside. There were nearly twice as many insiders as outsiders in larger systems over 100,000 inhabitants. Three kinds of outsiders were identified: hoppers, specialists, and statesmen. Hoppers moved frequently without benefitting their status or without leaving a lasting impression on the schools they served. Specialists were hired to do a special job such as financing or building; while they left a lasting impression, they left the job when they were finished. Statesmen left their jobs only when they felt they could do no more for the system.

Outsiders are looked to for creativity and are more likely to be hired when the school board is not satisfied with the present system. Thus, this pattern of mobility tends to be associated with lack of consensus. Insiders are hired to maintain stability, and are part of a consensual environment. Carlson concludes that the insider adapts or modifies himself to fit the office; his performance adds nothing new to the role, while the place bound superintendent seems to derive satisfaction from the office, but he does not bring status to it.

Both types of superintendents engaged in rule making upon taking office, but they were concerned with different types of rules. Insiders made rules which essentially sustained the existing situation, while 85 per cent of the outsiders' rules altered internal commitments or external ties of the system. Insiders' rules typically pertained to the technical-managerial facets of the school, such as turning in weekly reports, but outsiders' rules affected

the institutional level of the organization, such as establishing a kindergarten or employing social workers to serve the school.

Carlson concludes that while there are periods when insiders are needed, two insiders in a row may be one too many. Two consecutive insiders would mean that the system had endured an average of ten years of leadership without major adaptations to the environment. Carlson conjectures that, by comparison with business organizations which exist in a "wild environment," in which instant adaptation is necessary, public schools are "domesticated" in the sense that they are assured clients and income: they are able to exist longer without adapting.

Interaction Patterns

However, even if the personnel which are eventually recruited do have relatively different backgrounds, they will eventually develop some similarities if they (1) face similar problems, and (2) interact frequently. When people work under similar conditions, when their tasks are relatively undifferentiated, and when they have similar pay, they tend to develop common perceptions. Whyte uses the term "resonance" in reference to this tendency (83). A common enemy (e.g., the students, administration, pressure groups, or the State Department of Education), or a common cause (e.g., salary increases or more academic freedom), will lead persons to unite on certain aims. On the other hand, a division of labor which creates status differentials and conflicts of interest, promotes conflict. If there are two or more distinct classes of workers which each face different problems, the probability of overt conflict increases. The fact that public school teachers and administrators today constitute relatively specialized groups, each with its special problems, constitutes an undercurrent of insipient

conflicts among teachers and between teachers and administrators.

Participation in Decision-Making

Consensus within organizations is likely to be affected by two other organizational characteristics which may counteract the effects of similarity of problems and a favorable rate of interaction. They are (a) participation in the decision-making process, and (b) the relative position in the organization; this factor in turn involves several problems that arise from the authority system and the division of labor.

The more influence that employees have in the decision process, the more frequently they will have cause to disagree among themselves; conversely, if employees have no way to influence the decisions, conflict among them will be lessened because there is less to fight about. But, if they believe they have a right to more authority, this situation may increase conflicts between subordinates and their administrative superiors. For similar reasons, decentralizing authority may lessen conflicts between echelons and semi-autonomous departments while increasing friction within each echelon.

Position

The perspectives of personnel tend to be differentiated by the positions they occupy in the organization. This is not only because specialists have different interests; it is also because they have different contacts within and outside the organization. In this connection, March and Simon hypothesize that the greater the number of independent information sources, the greater the differences in perceptions within the organization. To the extent that all teachers rely on the same college of education,

state department of education, or community newspaper for information, conflict between them will diminish. Conversely, as the number of professional associations with their special points of view increase, intra-organizational conflicts will increase between regional and national organizations, the NEA, the National English Teachers' Association, AASA, principals', and superintendents' associations. As schools enlarge and specialize, differences in functions will increase conflicts between departments; for example, the perceptions that teachers in the academic program have of the school and its functions will be different from those of teachers in the non-academic and extra-curricular programs.

Problems of Subordination

One of the major structural characteristics of positions which is relevant to conflict is their place within the authority system. The authority system is responsible for the facts of subordination. The problems concerning subordination stem from (a) the inevitable separation of authority and responsibility, and from (b) the fact that the moral maximum "never to use a man as a mere means" is actually, as Simmel observed, the formula of modern organization (72). Among other things, the degree of ensuing conflict depends on the cohesion of subordinate groups, and the degree to which authority has been centralized. Conflict takes several forms, depending on the size and purpose of the organization, among which are conflicts over means and ends, realistic-non realistic conflict, and conflicts which can be termed either segmental or complete.

Several writers have commented on a variety of problems associated with subordination. Among them, Victor Thompson has

recently called attention to some of the special problems that arise within hierarchies which contribute to organizational conflict (80). The superior's "boss" role gives him the right to veto or affirm his subordinate's proposals without appeal, giving him near absolute power over the careers and to some extent, the personal lives of his subordinates. He believes that it is characteristic of such systems that people are never sure of "how they are doing;" this insecurity presumably increases as one goes up the hierarchy, there being more conformism to the boss' wishes as one rises in the system. Since mobile subordinates tend to adopt the values of their superiors, and since many sponsor persons in lower positions for higher jobs, conflict between superiors and subordinates is not as high as it might otherwise be. In this sense, he believes that a hierarchical system tends to favor the status quo. However, restrictions placed on subordinates by their superiors tend to frustrate their ambitions. Hostility is offset by superior qualities imputed to persons in higher status positions, and the further removed from the authority the more "awe" there is. That is, to some extent status is a function of ignorance. This "awe" also reinforces the status quo. Under these conditions persons are not judged on their merit so much as their compatability with the group and willingness to comply. This emphasis on compatability, compliance and loyalty subverts the technical criteria of specialization and professionalization.

But Thompson's argument is true only where the superior does hold near absolute power. In cases where subordinates develop the power to affect the way the superior is evaluated by his own

superior, the hierarchy can be very friction-ridden. Such is sometimes the case when students' complaints about their teachers reach the principal's ear. Thompson is sensitive to latent conflicts between the "rights" of subordinates for personal dignity, to be treated on the basis of merit, and to have extra organizational freedoms from superiors, and the "rights" of superiors to determine personnel behavior, to set goals, to veto and to settle conflicts; perhaps his analyses would have been more adequate had the implications of this been pursued. Gardner proposes that the fact that personnel must simultaneously face upward to superiors and downward to subordinates creates the paradox that subordinates are subservient to superiors who are indifferent to them (34). Dreyfess treats a series of problems including rigidity of bureaucracy arising from jealousy over rank among subordinates (31). One writer concludes that the closer one in authority over workers himself stands to them in respect to origin, education, rank of office and level of earnings, the more insistently he will display his authority; conversely, where differences in authority are slight, small deviations by subordinates will be interpreted as a threat to the supervisor's authority (29). Gouldner reports that it is actually resentment of authority that seems to lie behind charges of "red tape" (37). Common sources of conflict between management and employees have been analyzed by Dalton in his studies of factory management (27). Blau points to a strain created between two principles - the right of dissent (the basis of democracy), and the principle of efficiency (the basis of modern organization)(12). Davis describes conflicts in the Navy which were created by disparities between official authority and

specialization, separation of authority and responsibility, ambiguities in the definitions of jurisdictions, status anxiety, ritualism and ceremony (28).

Commitment and Involvement

Finally, the importance of consensus in relation to conflict depends to a great extent on how concerned personnel are with it all. Unlike many of the other conditions just described, this is likely to be personal rather than organizational consideration. It is a condition which accounts for the significance of organizational problems to people in the organization. The more important the goals and procedures of an organization are to personnel, the more likely they will fight to maintain them. This, in turn, is directly related to the degree of involvement that the personnel have in their careers. To the extent that women are less emotionally involved in their careers than men (i.e., they are more likely to quit), men will be more active in the militant activities of the vocation designed to improve their status. However, when people are committed to a job without necessarily being involved in its goals, the reverse is true. For example, a man who fears that he cannot get another job easily - i.e., he is committed to his present job - is reluctant to engage in any dispute which is likely to cost him his job. In general then, conflict is likely to increase as involvement with the welfare of teaching as a vocation increases, and as commitment to a specific job in teaching declines.

DETERENTS TO CONFLICT

While it is true that there are tension-producing dilemmas incorporated in most organizations, it is equally true that cer-

tain organizational principles function to minimize conflict.

Some of these principles will be recognized below. Mechanisms of segregation seem to be strategic ways by which conflict is regulated. For example, where the same individual is forced to perform conflicting obligations, he may be able to minimize the inconsistency by segregating the audiences that see him perform. Thus, the group that sees the teacher in his official role is not the group which sees the teacher smoking in the safety of the boiler room. A kind of calculated self-alienation which amounts to segregating one's commitment and involvement from what he is doing functions in the same way. A teacher, for example, may deny responsibility for having to teach children in an unsafe school building.

Whenever possible, organizations segregate conflicting functions as well as audiences by assigning conflicting obligations to different parties. Litwak suggests that the police force, for example, is assigned to guard the physical safety, and the newspapers guard the freedom of the press; but if both safety and freedom were to be the concern of a single organization, it is likely that one of the values would be suppressed or compromised (57).

The same principle is involved when some functions are delegated to local discretion, while others are handled by centralizing hierarchy. Physical distance, such as the distance that separates the high schools of a system, is another important mechanism of segregation. And, different criteria which are used to evaluate different personnel in the same organization presumably doing the same function also provide a way by which organizations cope with logically contradictory functions. Sherif suggests still another major means of reducing intergroup conflict -- the

use of "super-ordinate" goals (71). These are goals which appeal to the members of two or more groups that are in conflict with other organizations in the environment. However, whether or not conflict ensues also depends to a great extent on the organizational structure. For example, from a study of academic freedom in American colleges and universities, it has been concluded that the ability of colleges to withstand pressures is associated with the form of control over them and with their size. The authors of the study conclude that its size is directly related to the school's ability to withstand pressures, and that privately endowed, non-religious schools are better able to withstand pressures than are either publicly supported or religiously controlled colleges. Financial autonomy seemed to be particularly significant. On this point, Maccoby demonstrated that colleges independent of the public school systems are better able to defend academic freedom than colleges supported and controlled directly by public school districts (58).

IMPLICATIONS

Dennis Wrong has observed that the question originally posed by Hobbs, "How is society possible in a state of war of all against all?" has been transformed in modern thinking into its opposite, "How is it that selfishness and conflict exist at all?" (85). The assumption that conflict is exceptional and harmony normal, is nourished by what might be referred to as "institutional favoritism," or the exaggerated attention given to the ideals that dominate an institution. The assumption is also supported by "organizational bias," or the tendency to view all behavior in terms of its instrumental and logical contributions to the general

organizational ends, just as the assumption is also supported by an extensive use of structural concepts to study organizations; attention to abstract levels of "positions" leads the social scientist to overlook basic role conflicts within the position itself and within the structure of the positions, and the process by which these conflicts are resolved. There is especially a tendency to select out the "routine" or the entirely reciprocal activities in which the action of one party is reinforced by the return action of another. "Role" has been traditionally conceived in this context (41).

The assumption that peace is normal raises the question, "What causes conflict?" However, by starting with Hobbs' perspective, a more fundamental question must be answered: "What causes peace, hence organization?" Or, more specifically, "By what mechanisms do organizations deter and regulate conflict?" Burns proposes that far from being the "natural" aspect of organization, "routine" is a substitute for the normal process of change (13). What is recognized as "social change" and conflict is, then actually the failure of routine substitutes. Structure may be viewed as a temporary curtailment of the more fluid and variable processes. From this perspective, conflict is a fundamental process, knowledge of which is not incidental to, but crucial for understanding large scale organization.

THE THEORETICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF SIZE

The public school systems of the nation constitute a 15 billion dollar enterprise. Currently educators comprise over one-fifth of the 7 million persons working in professional capacities, and nearly one-fourth of the nation is engaged in the public

schools in one capacity or another. Public schools consume three-fourths of local tax expenditures and represent over 50 per cent of state and local government payrolls. In the last decade the staffs of the schools have expanded 150 per cent and there has been a 160 per cent increase in expenditures on public education. Public education has become a large scale enterprise almost overnight.

Even so, most of the nation's 135,000 schools are not yet especially large; yet it is safe to say that most of the nearly 40 million students in the country attend relatively large schools. Sixty-three per cent of the nation lives in 212 metropolitan centers which have accounted for 85 per cent of the population growth in the past ten years. Thus, a fifth of the nation's schools currently educate two-thirds of the U. S. population. Nationally, one-fifth of the districts educate two-thirds of the school children. As the consolidation of public schools proceeds, these trends will become even more exaggerated. Some authorities estimate that within the next ten to fifteen years there should be only 4,000 to 5,000 of the 35,000 districts remaining in the entire United States, which means that the smaller school districts are rapidly disappearing. What are the effects of this rapidly increasing size on staff relationships in the schools?

A number of studies on the influence of organizational size show that growth is associated with crucial changes in organizational characteristics. Some of the major characteristics associated with organizational size will be briefly discussed here.

Complexity

First, increases in organizational size tend to be accom-

panied by remarkable increases in the complexity of social relationships within the organization. Because people interact with pairs and combinations of other persons in addition to interacting as individuals, the number of possible relationships increases at a much faster rate than the increase of numbers. One writer estimates that in an organization of just seven persons there are 966 possible relationships. In the face of such "relational complexity," large organizations decompose into smaller units (29). Most organizations in fact actually operate in groups of two to seven members with the average size of three.

Organizational Autonomy

Large organizations are in a favorable position to achieve autonomy from outside pressure. Large organizations usually have several sources of financial support and they are more impervious to individual complaints than are smaller ones. In a study of academic freedom, for example, it was found that larger colleges and universities are better able than smaller ones to give their faculty support against outside criticisms (54).

Heterogeneity, Turnover

The heterogeneity and turnover of the members of an organization tends to increase with its size, and with it consensus declines. According to Grusky, larger organizations not only experience more turnover, but they need more turnover of leadership in order to maintain flexibility (15,42). He found that the size of business firms which he studied was related to the organization's stability as measured by length of life of the firm. That is to say, the more bureaucratized the administration of an organization, the less instability that is created by succession.

Role Conception and Consensus

From a study of eighty-three county welfare bureaus in the same state, Thomas found that size was negatively correlated with the extent of agreement among workers and supervisors on the roles of social workers, the number of activities seen as part of the social worker's role, their commitment to the ethics and ideals of social work, and their work performance on the job (78). Also role consensus has been found to be related to the job satisfaction of nurses (23). Gross found that role definitions are partially dependent upon the size of the organization (40). Superintendents of larger school systems, for example, assumed more responsibility for their subordinates' work than those of smaller ones. It has also been found that role conceptions depend on the degree of external control exercised over the organization, which in turn is sometimes associated with the organization's size. The source of revenue is an important factor. For example, one study of administrators of independent junior colleges reports that they were more likely to support the discussion of controversial issues than were their teachers (58); however, administrators working in non-autonomous junior colleges, attached to the public school system, were less likely to approve of teachers seeking-out controversial issues than those in autonomous colleges having their own tax district and a board of supervisors.

Contribution and Participation of Members

Thibaut and Kelley conclude that as a group becomes progressively smaller, its identity is increasingly dependent on maintaining each of its members (77). Conversely, elsewhere they report that with increasing size, the proportion of members in a group who are not contributors increases. In a small group study,

Bales finds that as size increases, the communication pattern tends to centralize around a top man through whom most of the communication flows (5). Studies by the Acton Society Trust found that interest in the affairs of the organization and knowledge of names of administrators was negatively related to size of the organization and that the acceptance of rumors was positively correlated to size (1). Subscription to professional periodicals, output, and punctuality were all negatively correlated to size. Indik reports that the size of ninety-six business organizations was positively correlated with difficulty in maintaining communication among members and negatively correlated with their participation (49). Campbell found that as size of work groups in a factory increased, the per cent of workers who did not understand the incentive group payment plan increased, and they became increasingly less satisfied with it (14).

The locus of real work, the seat of power, in organizations rests in these sub units and within these sub units power and influence tend to concentrate even further in the hands of one or two persons. Therefore, as size increases, the number of persons who actively contribute, and the extent of their contribution, declines significantly. This seems to suggest that the larger the school, the less likely are other students or teachers to share in, or to be affected by its culture. And, in fact, Le-compte and Barker have found that in high schools size is negatively correlated with participation in music festivals (55). Similarly, in churches, the size of the membership was negatively correlated with Sunday School attendance. Larson found a higher percentage of students in small schools, as compared to medium

and large ones, reported that it was easy to make friends, and that they liked all of their school acquaintances (53). Coleman found that the size of high schools was negatively related to the proportion of boys who participated in football, the ability of students to name an outstanding fellow student in certain areas, and consensus about persons in the student body who were outstanding in certain areas (18). Anderson, Ladd and Smith studied 2500 high school graduates and found that the percent who reported that their participation in extra curricular activities was very valuable was negatively correlated with the size of their school (2).

In a study supported by the Office of Education, Roger Barker and others found that large schools which have twenty-five times as many students as small schools, have only five times as many "behavior settings" and 1.5 times as many varieties of settings (6). In other words, a small school is not so small in terms of the number and variety of its parts; it simply has fewer replications and fewer differentiations of some of the parts. They found that the proportion of students who participated in district dramatic, journalistic, student government, and music festivals and competitions reached a peak in high schools with enrollments between 61 and 150. The proportion of participants was three to twenty times as great in small schools as in the larger schools. The average number of extra curricular activities and kinds of activities in which students engaged was twice as great in small as in large schools. It was also true that large school students participated in fewer classes and a smaller variety of classes than the small school students in spite of greater numbers and varieties of educational settings. However, the number of settings

in which students participated varied more among students in the large than in the small schools. Juniors in the small schools reported more satisfactions relating to the development of competence, being challenged, engaging in important actions, being involved in group activities and achieving moral and cultural values. Large school juniors, however, reported more satisfactions dealing with vicarious enjoyment, such as learning about their school's members and affairs and gaining extra curricular "points."

It was concluded that the differences in satisfaction were due primarily to the fact that students in small schools were able to occupy important and responsible positions in school settings due to the greater accessibility of such positions to the student body. No necessary connection was found between the properties of the schools, in terms of the opportunity the schools offer, and the experiences and behavior of the children in terms of taking advantage of these opportunities. The authors caution, in fact, that when better facilities are purchased at the expense of larger size, the facilities are discounted by lower participation rates of students. Schools differing in enrollment by 100 per cent handle only a 17 per cent median difference in instructional variety. They suggest that it may be easier to bring specialized and varied behavior settings to small schools than to raise the level of individual participation in large schools.

Morale

The morale of an organization's personnel seems to be directly associated with its size. In the academic freedom study it was found that the proportion of the faculty reporting "poor relations" between faculty and administration declined from 51

percent in the small schools to 21 per cent in the very large schools. As size increased, good relationships reported among the faculty declined from 50 per cent to 33 per cent. Also, Hare reports that persons in larger discussion groups were dissatisfied with group discussions; there was less consensus in larger groups compared to smaller ones (44). Katz found that higher group cohesion arose in smaller organizations; employees in smaller groups were more satisfied, and individual workers in small groups assumed more importance (51).

Baumgartel and Sobol found that the number of personnel at the airports of an airline was positively correlated with absenteeism. They believe that employees working in larger units were less attracted toward the work situation (8). Hewitt and Parfit found a positive correlation between size of work rooms or units and rates of non-sickness absence (46). Cleland found less turnover and absenteeism in smaller industrial plants that he studied (17). He attributed the finding to greater rapport and an "open door" administrative policy found in small plants.

From a study of ninety-three industrial organizations, Tallachi found that increases in size lead to increased division of labor, job specialization, and status differentiation, which in turn lead to decreases in satisfaction and morale and absenteeism and turnover (76). Along these lines Worthy proposes that increases in size exaggerate the division of labor, which in turn narrows the scope of responsibility of the job, depriving the worker from pride in his work and responsibility for the overall job (84). He maintains that complexity and status differentiation of large organizations reduces communication between groups, in-

creases group conflict and decreases satisfaction. Absenteeism and turnover could be expected to be high under such conditions. Worthy concludes that the morale in a large, retail mail-order house was influenced by the organization's size, the size of its community, the heterogeneity of its personnel, and the degree of specialization within it. In support of this thesis, Tallachi found a negative correlation ($r = -.67$) between the size of ninety-three industrial organizations and the level of their employees' satisfaction (76). The level of satisfaction was inversely associated with absenteeism, but it apparently was not related to turnover rates.

Effectiveness

Size seems to have similarly adverse effects on the effectiveness of organizations. Among some of the more curious effects of size on organizations, are those reported in studies by Revans (68). It was found, for example, that the number of accidents per person increases with the size of the industrial plant that is concerned. Moreover, the probability of dying after amputation has been found to increase with the size of the hospital. The number of strikes in factories increases with their size. Punctuality decreases with organizational size, as does output. The buying of professional periodicals is negatively correlated with the size of coal mines and commercial organizations. Revans believes that most of these findings are due to the lower supervisor ratios in larger organizations.

Marriote found a negative correlation between output of industrial organizations and size of the working group (60). In a similar investigation of a small factory, it was found that

the loss of working days for workers in small rooms was less than one half of the time lost among those in larger rooms. Absence due to sickness was curvilinearly related to size, but absences from all other causes were linearly related to size. This would suggest that the significant factor is not the total size of the organization, but the size of the work group. The effects of size on a school's ability to perform its functions is still indeterminate. However, Cook's observations are suggestive: there is a four year range in general intelligence of a random group of six year olds entering the first grade (22).

However, the apparently adverse effects of size on morale and productivity has not been consistently confirmed. In a recent study of 700 psychologists working in research organizations, the only prediction which held up in support of Worthy's thesis was a negative relation between the number of administrative levels and job satisfaction (84). The correlation between size and satisfaction was curvilinear, which means that both the largest and smallest organizations were more satisfying than intermediate ones. The number of levels of organizational administration was also curvilinearly related to productivity, and there was no relationship between size and productivity.

Size and Bureaucratization

The inconsistency of this last study with other findings raises important questions. The authors of the foregoing study suggest that the inconsistency may be due to the fact that size is correlated with so many other variables, such as better facilities which large organizations may have, that may compensate for the disadvantages of size. Also as the above study suggests, morale may be more directly related to the "bureaucratic" characteristics

of the organization (number of administrative levels) than to its size. If the crucial determinant is the degree of bureaucracy that an organization has achieved rather than its size, the relationship between size and bureaucratization becomes crucial. If size is associated with bureaucratization, adverse effects can be expected. However, Hall found that, contrary to common assumptions, neither the size nor the age of the twelve organizations in his sample was highly correlated with any of six "dimensions" of bureaucracy which he examined (43). The rank-order correlation of size with hierarchy of authority, for example, was .23, with division of labor .36 and with rules .39. Size was negatively correlated with procedures and the correlation with impersonality was only negligible.

Since administrators perform the bureaucratic functions of coordination and supervision, the ratio of administration to staff has been used as an index of how bureaucratic organizations are. A study of hospitals showed that the number of administrators necessary to a hospital, grew at a slower rate than the total staff size, but in a similar study of public school districts in California, it was found that the proportion of school administrators increased at a faster rate than total organizational size. In contrast to hospitals, then, it would appear that increases in the size of school districts exaggerate bureaucratic characteristics, at least insofar as the ratio of administrators to staff is an index of this. Anderson and Warcov suggest that the difference can be explained by the fact that school districts consist of physically dispersed units while hospitals do not (3). Physical dispersion of units requires more unit administrators

to coordinate the work. If this interpretation is valid, it means that increases in the size of school systems will involve very crucial kinds of changes in the bureaucratic characteristics of school systems. But it also suggests that what is significant is not the size of the school system itself so much as the way it is organized.

Another organizational feature of school systems, besides the fact of physical dispersion, is the level at which decisions are made; this also determines the number of administrative staff needed at each level; in a university which expects many of the policy and operational decisions to be made by professors, one dean can work with many more staff than if professors have to go to higher echelons to get decisions made. The same is true in the public schools. As teachers gain professional autonomy over their work and more power to make more decisions, the proportion of administrators to teachers will tend to decline independently of increases in organizational size.

IMPLICATIONS

While differences in the size of schools can be used as a point of departure for studying organizational tensions and their bearing on friction and role conflict, it should be apparent that it is not size itself that is important so much as the characteristics that it is sometimes associated with. Organizational complexity and bureaucratization seem to be of crucial importance; and since they are not always directly associated with size, they deserve examination in their own right. The present study has attempted to develop at least crude indices of several of the more important organizational characteristics, such as centralization

of decision making, standardization of work, specialization of personnel, heterogeneity of personnel backgrounds, and others. These variable components of "bureaucracy" can be and should be considered independently until the magnitude of their intercorrelation has been established.

REFERENCES

1. Action Society Trust. Size and Morale (London, 1953).
2. Anderson, K. E., Ladd, G. E., & Smith, H. A. "A Study of 2500 Kansas High School Graduates." Kansas Studies in Education (University of Kansas, 1954), p. 4.
3. Anderson, Theodore, R., and Warkov, Seymour. "Organizational Size and Functional Complexity," American Sociological Review, 26 (February 1961), pp. 23-27.
4. Argyris, Chris. "Understanding Human Behavior in Organizations: One Viewpoint," Modern Organization Theory (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1959), p. 51. (Mason Haire, ed.).
5. Bales, R. F. "The Equilibrium Problems in Small Groups," in T. Parsons, R. Bales, and E. Shils (eds.), Working Papers in the Theory of Action (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1953), pp. 111-161.
6. Barker, R. G. "Ecology and Motivation," in M. Jones (ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1960), pp. 1-49.
7. Barnard, Jessie. "Where is the Modern Sociology of Conflict?" American Journal of Sociology, 56 (1950), pp. 11-16.
8. Baumgartel, H., & Sobol, R. "Background and Organizational Factors in Absenteeism," Personnel Psychology (1959), pp. 431-443.
9. Becker, Howard S., and Geer, Blanche. "The Fate of Idealism in Medical School," American Sociological Review, 23:1 (February 1958), pp. 50-56.
10. Bendix, Reinhart. "Bureaucracy: The Problem and Its Setting," American Sociological Review, 12 (October 1947), pp. 502-504.
11. Bennis, W. G. and others. "Reference Groups and Loyalties in the Out-Patient Department," Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 2 (1957-58), pp. 481-500.
12. Blau, Peter. Bureaucracy in Modern Society (Random House, 1950).
13. Burns, Tom. "Friends, Enemies and the Polite Fiction," American Sociological Review, 18 (1953), pp. 654-62; and "The Forms of Conduct," The American Journal of Sociology, LXIV (September 1958), pp. 137-151.
14. Campbell, H. "Group Incentive Pay Schemes," Occupational Psychology, 26 (1953), pp. 15-21. Cited by Hewitt, D., and Parfit, J. (1953).

15. Carlson, Richard O. Executive Succession and Organizational Change; Place-Bound and Career-Bound Superintendents of Schools (Midwest Administration Center: The University of Chicago, 1963), pp. 30-35.
16. Chapple, Eliot D. and Sayles, Leonard R. in Modern Organisation Theory, M. Haire, ed. p. 161.
17. Cleland, S. Influence of Plant Size on Industrial Relations, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955).
18. Coleman, J. S. The Adolescent Society (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1961).
19. Collins, Orvis. "Ethnic Behavior in Industry: Sponsorship and Rejection in a New England Factory," American Journal of Sociology, 51 (January 1946), pp. 293-298.
20. Conant, James. Slums and Suburbs (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961).
21. Conant, James. Education and Liberty (New York: Harcourt, 1932).
22. Cook, Walter. "The Gifted and Retarded in Historical Perspective," The Phi Delta Kappan, 39 (March 1958).
23. Corwin, R., Taves, M., and Haas, E. Role Conception and Vocational Success and Satisfaction: A Study of Student and Professional Nurses (Columbus: Bureau of Business Research, The Ohio State University, 1963).
24. Coser, Lewis A. The Functions of Social Conflict (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1956).
25. Crozier, Michel. "Human Relations at the Management Level in a Bureaucratic System of Organization," Human Organization, 19 (1960), pp. 51-64.
26. Daerendorf, Ralf. "Out of Utopia: Toward a Reorientation of Sociological Analysis," American Journal of Sociology (September 1958).
27. Dalton, Melville. Men Who Manage (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1959).
28. Davis, Arthur K. "Bureaucratic Patterns in the Navy Officer Corps," Social Forces, 27 (December 1948), pp. 143-153.
29. DeMann, Henri. "Reaction to Subordination" from Joy in Work (London, 1929) in Human Relations in Industry, Robert Dubin, ed., p. 279.
30. Dimock, Marshall E. "Bureaucracy Self-Examined, Public Administrative Review, IV, 3 (Summer 1944), pp. 197-207.
31. Dreyfess, Carl. "Prestige Grading: A Mechanism of Control, in Reader in Bureaucracy, eds., R. K. Merton, A. Gray, B. Hockey and H. Selvin (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1952), pp. 258-264.

32. Eurich, Alvin O. "Schools Need More Than Money," The Nation, 186 (May 10, 1958), pp. 404-406.
33. Ford, Thomas R. and Stephenson, Diane D. "Institutional Nurses: Role Relationships and Attitudes in Three Alabama Hospitals," (University of Alabama Press, 1954).
34. Gardner, Burleigh. Human Relations in Industry (Chicago: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1945), p. 34.
35. Gordon, C. W. "Formal Student Organizations," The Social System of the High School (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957).
36. Gottlieb, David. "American Graduate Students: Some Characteristics of Aspiring Teachers and Researchers," Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 52 (1961), pp. 236-240.
37. Gouldner, Alvin W. "Organizational Tensions," Sociology Today, Robert Merton, et. al., eds. (New York: Basic Books, 1959), pp. 400-428.
38. Gouldner, Alvin. Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1954).
39. Gouldner, Alvin W. "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles I, II," Administrative Science Quarterly, 2 (1957-1958), p. 281 ff and 444 ff.
40. Gross, Neal. Who Runs Our Schools? (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958).
41. Gross, Neal; Mason, Ward, & McEachern, A.W. Explorations in Role Analysis (John Wiley & Sons, 1958).
42. Grusky, Oscar. "Corporate Size Bureaucratization, and Managerial Succession," The American Journal of Sociology, LXVII (November 1961), pp. 261-269.
43. Hall, Richard H. "The Concept of Bureaucracy: An Empirical Assessment," The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 69 (July 1963), pp. 32-40.
44. Hare, A. P. "A Study of Interaction and Consensus in Different Sized Groups," American Sociological Review, 17 (1952), pp. 261-267.
45. Henry, Jules. "The Formal Structure of A Psychiatric Hospital," Psychiatry, 17 (May 1954).
46. Hewitt, D., & Parfit, J. "A Note on Working Morale and Size of Group," Occupational Psychology, 27 (1953), pp. 38-42.
47. Homans, George C. The Human Group (Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1950).

48. Hughes, Everett C. "The Making of a Physician -- General Statement of Ideas and Problems," Human Organization (Winter 1956). pp. 21-25.
49. Indik, B. P. "Organization Size and Member Participation." A paper read at the American Psychology Association, New York, September 1961.
50. Janowitz, Morris. Sociology and the Military Establishment (Russell Sage Foundation, 1959).
51. Katz, D. "Morale and Motivation in Industry," in W. Dennis (ed.), Current Trends in Industrial Psychology (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1949), pp. 145-171.
52. Landsberger, Henry A. "The Horizontal Dimension in Bureaucracy," Administrative Science Quarterly (December 1961), pp. 299-332.
53. Larson, Carol M. "School Size as a Factor in the Adjustment of High School Seniors," Bulletin No. 511, Youth Series No. 6 (State College of Washington, 1949).
54. Lazarsfeld, Paul and Theilens, Wagner, Jr., The Academic Mind (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1958).
55. LeCompte, W. F., & Barker, R. G. "The Ecological Framework of Cooperative Behavior," a paper read at the American Psychology Association. Chicago, September 1960.
56. Levenson, Bernard. "Bureaucratic Succession," in Complex Organizations: A Sociological Reader, ed. Amitai Etzioni (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961), pp. 262-275.
57. Litwak, Eugene. "Models of Bureaucracy Which Permit Conflict," American Journal of Sociology (September 1961), pp. 177-185.
58. Maccoby, Herbert. "Controversy, Neutrality, and Higher Education," American Sociological Review, 25 (1960), pp. 884-893.
59. March, James and Simon, Herbert. Organizations (John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958).
60. Marriott, R. "Size of Working Group and Output," Occupational Psychology, 23 (1949), pp. 47-57.
61. Marshall, T. H. "The Recent History of Professionalism in Relation to Social Structure and Social Policy," Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, V (August 1939), pp. 325-340.
62. Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957).
63. Nock, Albert. The Theory of Education in the United States (New York: Harcourt, 1932).

64. Park, Robert E. "The Social Function of War," American Journal of Sociology, XLVI (1941), pp. 551-570.
65. Parkinson, N. Parkinson's Law (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1957), p. 7.
66. Parrow, Charles. "Organizational Prestige: Some Functions and Dysfunctions," American Journal of Sociology, 66 (1961), pp. 335-341.
67. Reisman, David. Constraint and Variety in American Education (New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1958).
68. Revans, R. W. "Human Relations, Management, and Size," in E. Hugh-Jones (Ed.), Human Relations and Modern Management (Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing Co., 1958), pp. 177-220.
69. Ross, Edward A. The Principles of Sociology (New York: The Century Co., 1920), p. 162.
70. Rossi, Peter. Why Families Move (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1955).
71. Sherif, Muzafer. "Group Influence Upon the Formation of Norms and Attitudes" in Readings in Social Psychology, eds. G. Swanson, T. Newcomb, and E. Hartley (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1952), pp. 246-261.
72. Simmel, George. The Sociology of George Simmel, trans., Kurt H. Wolff (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1950).
73. Small, Albion W. General Sociology (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1905).
74. Smigel, Edwin O. "Recruitment and the Large Law Firm," American Sociological Review, Vol. 25, No. 1 (Feb. 1960), pp. 56-66.
75. Suttuff, John. "Local-Cosmopolitan Orientation and Participation in School Affairs," Administrator's Notebook, Vol. IX, (November 1960).
76. Talacchi, Sergio. "Organization Size, Individual Attitudes and Behavior: An Empirical Study," Administrative Science Quarterly, 5 (1960) pp. 398-420.
77. Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. The Social Psychology of Groups (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1959).
78. Thomas, Edwin J. "Role Conceptions and Organizational Size," American Sociological Review, 14 (February 1959).
79. Thompson, James D. "Organizational Management of Conflict," Administrative Science Quarterly, 4 (March 1960).
80. Thompson, Victor A. "Hierarchy, Specialization and Organizational Conflict," Administrative Science Quarterly, 5 (1961), pp. 485-521.

81. Vold, George. Theoretical Criminology (New York: Oxford Press, 1958), Chapters 11, 12 and 13.
82. Weber, Max. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization (New York, Oxford University Press, 1947).
83. Whyte, William F. "An Interaction Approach to the Theory of Organization," in Modern Organizational Theory, Mason Haire, ed. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1959).
84. Worthy, James C. "Organizational Structure and Employee Morale," American Sociological Review, 15 (1950), pp. 169-179.
85. Wrong, Dennis H. "The Oversocialized Conception of Man," American Sociological Review, Vol. 26, No. 2 (April 1961), pp. 183-193.

Chapter 3

ROLE CONFLICTS AND FRICTION IN ORGANIZATIONS: THE LITERATURE

"After all, he's principal, he's the boss, what he says should go, you know what I mean...he's the principal and he's the authority, and you have to follow his orders. That's all there is to it.

"Another thing, I don't think a parent should try and tell you what to do in your classroom, or interfere in any way with your teaching...after all, I've a special education to fit me to do what I am doing..."*

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS

It is worth noting at the outset that the term "role" has been used in a variety of often conflicting and confusing ways. Perhaps the major difference is that sometimes the reference is to specific expectations of persons in interpersonal reciprocal relationships, while at other times it refers to only general standards or ideals, such as "be honest as a preacher"; in this usage the specific interpersonal relationships are secondary.

Theoretical orientations for examining role conflict (primarily in the first use of the term) in complex organizations have been advanced by Gross, Argyris, Stogdill, Getzels, and Getzels and Guba (31,1,52,26,27). The last describes a social system in parallel individual and group terms: institution-individual, role-person, and expectation-need disposition. Types of conflict presumably occur between (1) cultural values and institutional expectations, (2) role expectations and need dispositions of role incumbents, (3) inconsistencies between roles, and (4) conflicts between persons on an individual basis.

*Becker, Howard S., "The Teacher in the Authority System of the Public School", Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 27 (November 1953), pp. 128-141.

In the present study conflicts between cultural values and institutional expectations, and inconsistencies of role conceptions will be the primary focus of attention.

Drawing freely on the tradition of Max Weber and recent systematic statements of Talcott Parsons, Getzels considers the primary factor in the administrative process to be the subordinate-superior relationship (26). He sees three dimensions in the study of educational administration: authority (the source of superordinate dominance and subordinates' acceptance), scope (range of roles and facilities) and affectivity (nature of personal interaction between the parties). He classifies authority into three types based on Weber's discussion: traditional, charismatic, and rational. He believes that traditional, charismatic and non-legitimate forms of authority are ineffective in educational settings. Under rational authority, both parties in the relationship occupy a professional status and are experts in their own rights.

Again, after Parsons, the scope of roles and facilities are divided by Getzels into functionally "diffuse" and functionally "specific" components. The administrative role, he asserts, must be functionally specific; but no other relationship is so caught up in multiple pressures. Because of changing political, social and economic cost trends, the administrator is inevitably exposed to the danger of functional diffusion. "Affectivity" is also divided into two categories: particularistic and universalistic. In education, Getzels points out that the problem of maintaining face-to-face relationships is difficult because of the distance between the superintendent and the classroom teacher. Getzels believes that the administrative relationship in education is

"segmentally functional"; in theory it is universal but in practice it becomes to some degree particularistic, roles and facilities being allocated in particularistic terms instead of rational ones.

Argyris elaborates on the "expectation-need disposition" type of conflict in the Getzels-Guba model, explaining conflicts of individuals with organizations in terms of characteristics in the chain of command which contrast with the role of "adulthood" (1). According to him, many characteristics in the chain of command are more appropriate to the state of "infantilism," such as: passivity (or the lack of initiative), dependability, few abilities and behavior patterns, shallow, casual interests, short-time perspectives, subordination, and lack of awareness of self. On the other hand, adulthood is commonly associated with the opposite characteristics, such as initiative, independence, variety of ability or behavior patterns, deep and common interests, long time perspectives, dominant status and feelings of self-awareness.

Stogdill proposes that conflict occurs when various reference groups hold inconsistent expectations of the occupant of the position (52). The model seems to explicate a dimension that was only implicit in the Getzels-Guba model, namely, the audiences for whom the incumbent is playing his role. This model also recognizes the institution-individual role conflict that occurs when personal values or backgrounds are different. It locates conflict within the roles themselves when they are not clearly defined, and it delineates various dimensions of role conception, such as authority and responsibility.

The model advocated by Gross and his colleagues stresses one aspect of the above, dissent on definitions about interpersonal relations between members of official positions (31).

Gross and his associates are critical of the assumption that consensus on roles is normal; the model is specifically designed to measure the amount of dissent among various audiences on the role conception of the incumbents of a position. It was found, for example, that an almost equal proportion of parents want superintendents to stress the three R's, and to expand their programs.

Inconsistencies of role expectations have been observed in a number of other settings, including the hospital. Bennis, for example, has described two major types of role tensions in nursing: blurred self image and interpersonal conflicts among professionals. and between professionals and administrators (7). The present author has found evidence that role clarity and role disagreement are associated with the ambitions of nurses (17).

In the above models, either the social position in its entirety or the particular roles which comprise the position. are the focal concepts. That is, what is studied is either the position of teacher or its role components, such as teacher-student or teacher-administrator. However, it is also possible to conceptually divide roles into abstract segments, i.e., norms of a similar type but not of a similar content. For example, it is possible to study the "authoritarian" segment of several roles of the teacher -- e.g., of teacher-student and teacher-principal roles. Such "role segments" may also consist of inconsistent norms.

Seeman, for example, describes several "dimensions" of

role conflicts that were experienced by school superintendents; these "dimensions" are essentially role segments, and the conflicts develop because of inconsistencies within segments (49). First, the status dimension involves a conflict between the success ideology on the one hand and an equality ideology on the other. The dilemma creates a "leadership guilt" because the leader has a place of special privilege that is alien to the democratic expectations. A second dimension of conflict pertains to the authority segment. The conflict here involves the anomaly of dependence and independence. Thus, many teachers and administrators want to have more voice in the system, but they are reluctant to accept the responsibility that goes along with it.

A third area of conflict lies in the institutional dimension, which involves a choice between universalistic (objective) as against particularistic criteria of evaluation. One of the major conflicts here concerns one's obligations of friendship as opposed to his obligations to society. Thus, a principal is supposed to be a "good Joe" with the teachers and invite them to his home, etc., but at the same time he is supposed to maintain the standards of professional objectivity in evaluating them. Chief administrators often avoid developing friendships with their subordinates precisely in order to avoid this type of conflict (31).

Another set of conflicts arise over the means-ends dimension, or in other words, the conflict between getting the practical job done as against emphasis on the quality of the work done. Thus, leaders in groups must not only pay attention to the task that they are supposed to accomplish, but also to

the matter of morale, to interpersonal relations and to the personal problems of the members of the group. Seeman found elementary principals expressed more of this ambivalence than high school principals; but actually principals, on the whole, showed less ambivalence toward these dimensions than did teachers in describing the "ideal leader" (49).

One of the major segmental conflicts that develops in modern specialized and complex bureaucracies is the one mentioned in the previous chapter: conflicts between the professional and employee expectations. Whether or not the teacher is interacting with students, parents, or the administration, he or she is supposed to simultaneously act as a professional person and as an employee of the school system and community. This dual status does not always create conflict, and when it does, the role conceptions may be regulated by some of the segregating mechanisms mentioned previously. Nevertheless, pervading almost every role relationship of the teacher position, the professional-employee status conflicts are inescapable, and one of the potentially major problems with which the modern teacher must learn to live. Therefore, some attention will be paid in this discussion to the development of employee and professional role segments and the resulting professional-employee status orientation conflicts in teaching.

CONCEPTUALIZING ROLE CONFLICT

Some conflicts arise because of inconsistencies between official and societal positions. Other conflicts are incorporated within the positions themselves. These intra-position conflicts can be conceptualized somewhat along the following lines. A

position within the formal organization will be defined here as an "office." It is a "position" in the sense that the norms which specify the rights and obligations of parties to the relationship tend to place the worker socially with respect to other workers. These prescribed relationships with others are called "roles." A teaching role is, then, a shorthand way of talking about the norms that regulate the teacher's relationships with students, with the administration, with parents, or others. Accordingly, a "position" is a shorthand summary of all of these teaching roles.

It is important to recognize that, technically, a role pertains to interaction. That is, a role is not merely part of one position, but it is related to two (or more) positions, all of which must be considered if the total role is to be comprehended. But the conceptions of various role partners do not always correspond, in which case a conspiracy may arise, or compromise of the ideal role otherwise adopted. Therefore, to fully understand the role of the teacher in the school, it is not only necessary to analyze the teachers' role conceptions, but those of students, parents, the administration, the school board, etc. On the other hand, it is usually true that for any given position some role relationships are more crucial than others. For example, the teachers' relationships with the administration are crucial determinates of the pattern of the professional and the employee roles of teachers.

As already intimated, roles can be visualized either in terms of their total scope (i.e., the full range of norms that comprise the role), or in terms of a limited range of norms of

a similar type, or a "segment." Some role segments tend to be associated with a few roles; for example, the "disciplinarian" is found primarily in the teacher-student, or teacher-principal roles. On the other hand, other role segments, such as the "consideration role" (i.e., to show consideration of others), are found in most of the roles of most positions. Both "professional" norms, or role segments, and "employee" norms, or role segments, are generally found in all of the teachers' major roles. There are, for example, norms regulating the amount of initiative, authority and compliance expected of teachers in relationship to students, peers, administrators, the school board, and the public.

Within each segment, it seems possible to identify a few norms which are the most crucial to the segment, and assess teachers' conceptions of them independently of their conceptions of the remaining role segments. In doing this, of course, analysis of complete roles is sacrificed for an intensive analysis of selected segments of them. However, the advantage is that similar segments of otherwise independent positions can be compared; for example, the professional segment of the nurse-physician role in the hospital has similarities to the professional segment of the teacher-principal role in a different status system. Just as official positions are comprised of the entire set of official roles, so a particular segment abstracted from each of the roles may be viewed as a "position," an unofficial or latent one. That is to say, the teacher's employee status can be ascertained by abstracting the employee segments from each of the teachers' roles. This is not a position that is formally incorporated in the official structure in any crucial way - except in the

general sense that anyone on the payroll is an employee, or in the sense that everyone except clerical and maintenance personnel is professional. These informal statuses, in other words, have not been created by the school as distinct positions. However, they are recognized as social statuses in the sense that they are acknowledged by the society and institutionalized; there are employee organizations (e.g., unions), and the professional is accorded a state license. Viewed within the context of the organization, then, these institutional statuses might be considered to be "latent" positions, in the sense that they are not deliberately created and sometimes not even officially recognized by it. But from the viewpoint of the society as a whole, they are completely deliberate.

Just as it is possible to assess the conceptions which staff members hold of these unofficial, latent, role segments, so also it is possible to assess their conceptions of the total configuration of these segments, or in other words, their "status orientations."* To study the problem, two status orientation scales will be developed, one to measure the total configuration of conceptions which respondents have of their professional role segments and the other for their employee role segments. Each status orientation scale will consist of subsets of items, or indicators of the "role orientations" that comprise the total status orientation scale.

There are several advantages in using the concept of role as it has been conceptualized here. As Bates has pointed out, the

*The term "orientation" is being used in connection with role segments, to distinguish the term "conception" which is usually used in reference to total roles.

concept permits analysis of the internal consistencies, inconsistencies and changes associated with a single position, and within a single role (2). It is not only a useful concept for analyzing interaction between positions and the influence that one position has on another, but it is potentially useful for studying the process by which conflicts between positions are compromised and roles synthesized. Since the same role can be associated with more than one position, the concept provides a convenient tool for identifying and analyzing similarities between otherwise independent positions (such as the similarities in professional role segments of otherwise different types of vocational groups). However, at the same time, because roles cannot be studied or visualized apart from their context, the conceptualization cautions against unwarranted generalization from one situation to another.

It is advisable, however, to proceed with caution in working with the concept role. Several writers have called attention to several theoretical problems imbedded in the concept (43). Most notable perhaps, but least devastating, are the variety of definitions (or lack of definitions) which have been attached to the term. The term has been used to denote a variety of levels of abstraction; the term role may refer to interaction between specific individuals (Mr. A and Mr. B), between the official positions in a specific group (nurses and doctors in hospital A), or between categories in the society (e.g., men and women). Since behavior occurs in specific settings, it is especially easy to overlook the influences of categorical roles. Yet, the fact that teachers, physicians and lawyers share the categorical role of professional, provides them with a similar perspective regardless of their personalities or the specific organization in which they work.

As just mentioned, the term is often confused with, or at least used interchangeably with "role segments" which are sometimes merely adjectives (i.e., the role of predatory females). Sometimes also, categorical and segmental roles are compounded (e.g., the role of a "democratic" person); this provides a very different type of concept than when the term is used in the specific and complete sense (e.g., the role of Mrs. Brown, the teacher, and John, the pupil). That is to say then, the term has been used in conjunction with every level of analysis -- from societal position to dyadic relationships between specific parties or between hypothetical categories. But, while this array of useages may be confusing, it is not as devastating as some critics claim. Perhaps a special term is needed to identify each usage, but as long as the operations used to define them are identified and their meanings delineated, the usages need not be confused in practice.

A more basic criticism concerns the "static" picture of interaction which the term "role" implicitly portrays as it usually has been defined in conventional methodologies (57). Several operational procedures commonly used in research seem to be responsible for this "static" portrayal. The relative inattention to the complex interaction process -- i.e., what all counterparts in the relationship believe and do -- contributes to the static conception. The tendency has been to determine what one role partner believes -- e.g., administrators -- without accessing the conceptions of the counterpart -- e.g., teachers. Moreover, in an almost exclusive focus on attitudes, or the normative quality of roles (expectations), the relationship between the role and the actual role behavior of those enacting it has been relatively

ignored; the role deprivation reflected in the discrepancy between role conception and behavior is undoubtedly an overlooked and important part of the dynamics of roles (19). But the most important reason that the dynamics of roles have been relatively neglected can be attributed to the relative absence of longitudinal studies which would show how roles are modified over time. Such studies would show that roles are not as "fixed" as the response pattern at any one time seems to imply. While there has been a great deal of attention given to research on role "conflict", little attention has been given to the outcomes of these conflicts -- conflict modifies behavior, and in turn modifies the roles themselves (28).

The impact of role deprivation, comparisons between role partners, attention to patterns of initiative and compliance, the relationship between role conception and conflict and its outcome are all variables to be studied in the present project. Chapter 5 describes some of the operational procedures for identifying these concepts. However, the present study is but the first step toward a long range effort to study over time the dynamics of organizations and their roles. It is hoped that it will provide a basis for an extended longitudinal study of the outcomes of role conflict which is presently so badly needed.

Types of Role Conflict

There is a quality of intrigue about the way in which roles have been conceptualized; for, the conceptualization allows for the fact that the norms and roles that comprise an office may be inconsistent and create moral dilemmas by which officials cannot fulfill some of the ideals of their offices simultaneously. To fulfill all of the ideals, others must be violated.

Four types of these inconsistencies, or role conflicts, can be distinguished. First, two or more positions held by the same person may be incompatible. A school board member who is also a local contractor represents this situation when bids are let by the school board for building contracts; he has a conflict of interest. Sometimes the medical views of the American Medical Association regarding social welfare legislation place school board members who are also members of that organization in compromising positions with respect to the way the school treats the question of medical care for the aged.

When there is a conflict between a person's part-time positions and his full time ones, the obligations of the former are likely to be sacrificed. For example, in one state, a legislator who is also a lawyer has been unsuccessfully involved in defending schools in his district against the State Department of Education's efforts toward consolidation. Since he is also on the State Senate's Committee on Education, he is in a position to effectively restrain his legal opponent by withholding financial support for the Department of Education.

Second, two or more roles of a single office may be inconsistent. The superintendent, for example, is the executive officer of the school board, and at the same time represents the teachers. When it comes to getting salary increases he may be torn between the expectations of these two roles. Also, the superintendent is expected to maintain good public relations with the parents (superintendent-parent role), but at the same time he is supposed to "back up his teachers" in the face of pressure from parents (superintendent-teacher role); to do both may force him to compromise both kinds of expectations.

Third, the norms or role segments which comprise a single role may be inconsistent with one another. For example, the superintendent may be expected by the professionals in the system to give first consideration to curriculum development, while at the same time the school board sees the budget as his primary responsibility. His role as financial officer may also frequently involve inconsistent pressure to keep operating costs at a minimum, forcing him to slight maintenance of buildings and equipment, in the long run a more expensive practice. Similarly, a teacher is expected to act toward the principal in a professional capacity as well as an employee, while the principal is considered to be a professional in his own right, and "the boss."

Finally, within a single relationship, the rights of one position may be without corresponding obligations in another position. For example, most superintendents of schools would argue that they have a right to expect the board of education to employ only personnel that are recommended by themselves. The board, however, is under no legal obligation to follow such a policy.

Role Typologies

Marvick was able to identify three career types in a federal agency carrying on a research-coordinating and research-subsidizing program for national defense (38): institutionalists, almost all of whom were not professionals in the first place, and whose entire orientation was that of the organization; specialists, slightly more than half of whom were professionals to the extent that they had higher degrees, and most of whom tended to maintain their professional orientations; and finally, hybrids, less than half of whom have had higher degrees and who seem to have neither a professional

nor an organizational orientation, but whose behavior was governed mainly by what is most expedient for their own individual careers.

Another author identifies four types of role conceptions held by personnel working in a government agency, depending on the relative stress given to the professional and employee roles (48). The "functional bureaucrat" seeks recognition from the professional group rather than from the organization in which he works. He considers the quality of his work more important than his ability to use bureaucratic procedures; and because a bureaucracy is less important to him in all respects, there is no conflict between his professional aims and the organizational means that he uses. The "specialist bureaucrat" is procedurally conservative and identifies primarily with the people with whom he works; he normally has been forced into his profession and is unaware of differences between bureaucratic and professional roles. The "service bureaucrat" is oriented to the bureaucratic means but also seeks recognition from professional groups outside of the bureaucracy which supports his professional ends. The "job bureaucrat" uses professional skills as entrance requirements into a bureaucratic job, but then seeks primarily departmental recognition and material rewards from the job. Technical competence is a primary source of satisfaction for him, and he accepts the structure of the organization as it is.

Page describes similar ways in which college faculties conceive of their bureaucratic roles (44). The "ritualist" fanatically obeys all rules and regulations of the official organization; the "neurotic" frets about the discrepancy between the roles that are supposed to be played and actual practices; the "robber baron" cuts

"red tape" and uses the system for what he feels were its original professional ends; while the "rebel" disregards all bureaucratic rules.

Ben-David has elaborated a typology of medical roles based on a study of physicians' attitudes toward out-patients being treated under an insurance plan; the physicians were employed in a bureaucratic setting in which the organization rather than the physician is responsible for the patient (5). As criteria for the typology, he used physicians' attitudes toward therapeutic efficiency, good patient relations, and scientific progress. Physicians who were primarily concerned about therapeutic efficiency might be termed "bureaucratic" doctors. Ben-David describes "service oriented" physicians as those whose loyalty is to be a defined circle of patients. "Science" oriented doctors had less regard for patient relationships. They tried to dominate the patient more than did the service oriented physicians, and they sought more external status. The significance of this particular typology is that it begins to differentiate between different types of professionally oriented personnel in terms of the specific reference group to which they are oriented. It seems particularly significant to differentiate professionals who are primarily oriented to their clients from professionals oriented to their own colleagues.

PROFESSIONAL AND EMPLOYEE ROLES

Employee Roles

Their Significance

The bureaucratization of American society is one of the most fundamental developments of this century. With this growth of large scale organization during the past fifty years, this nation has become what Drucker has termed an "employee society." (21). It is

the rights and obligations between employer and employee that increasingly determines the character of work and of society. Drucker observes that one of the most significant changes in this development is the disappearance of the "employer." Today people work for a "boss" in large organizations, but they do not work for the "employer;" they are being assimilated into an increasingly "impersonal system."

The influence of bureaucracy on the stereotype of the modern American hero is discernable in American literature(25). The plot of many current novels analyzed by Friedsam centers around the fact that the hero is a bureaucrat. The dilemma posed in such novels is that, while the employee ought to be able to afford the luxury of his own integrity, he finds himself in a context in which bureaucracy increasingly sets the conditions of his intellectual life and controls the major market for its products. Since the practitioners of intellectual life, the symbol manipulators in general, have become paid wage laborers, hired hands, the conflict between the hired hand and free mind conceptions of the modern specialist is a prevalent plot. The conflict is essentially one between self integrity (or professional integrity) and the practical requirements of existence(as an employee) in a bureaucracy. The conflict may be resolved in one of two possible ways. In the romantic solution the hero rebels against bureaucracy; in the tragic, he succumbs to it. William Whyte has alerted the public to such dilemmas in his popular essay on the "Organization Man" (60).

Many of the barbs, criticisms and complaints about modern education are aimed at characteristics of bureaucracy: the standardization of work, the centralization of authority, and the specialization

of personnel.

Bureaucracy Conceptualized

Before discussing bureaucratic or employee role conceptions, it is advisable to discuss the idea of bureaucracy itself. Blau defines bureaucracy as a type of organization designed to accomplish large-scale administrative tasks by way of systematic coordination (10). That is, "bureaucracy" refers to the principles of order that are used to improve administrative efficiency. However, efficiency is not the only function of bureaucracy. Udy proposes that bureaucracy rationality (or efficiency) and bureaucratic are two distinctly opposed characteristics which have been confounded in an ideal type (58). Bureaucracy, according to Udy, consists of a hierarchial authority structure, specialized administrative staff, and differentiated rewards according to office. However, rationality includes limited objectives, performance emphasis, segmental participation, and compensatory rewards in return for participation. The former concepts suggest an authoritarian basis of bureaucratic authority, while rationality is based on competence. Udy's evidence, gathered from cross cultural area files, suggests that these two variables can be empirically inconsistent within the same organization. This would help to explain the laymen's charge that "bureaucracy" is inefficient "red tape" in the face of usual descriptions of bureaucracy as a system that stresses efficiency. If there is an inverse relationship between rationality and bureaucracy, the criterion of efficiency might be omitted in the definition and reserved for hypotheses.

Udy's findings suggest a further caution. The various characteristics that define bureaucracy, whatever they happen to be, are not always necessarily correlated with one another. There has been

an unfortunate tendency in the literature on bureaucracy to classify organizations as "bureaucratic" or "non-bureaucratic" on the basis of some assumed correlated configuration of variables, which is to ignore the possibility that an organization can be highly bureaucratized on some characteristics and not on others. Hall attempted to measure six "dimensions" of bureaucracy in ten organizations, using Likert type scales: division of labor, a well defined hierarchy authority, a system of rules, a system of procedures, impersonality, and promotion and selection based on technical competence (33). The organizations ranged in size from 65 to over 3,000 employees and in age from 4 to 63 years. Using the Spearman rank-order correlation method, although several of the dimensions reached a positive correlation of .6 or higher, none of the intercorrelation coefficients between the dimensions was significant at the 5 per cent level. The hierarchy of authority dimension was most highly correlated with the other dimensions. At best, the highest correlations (.678 between impersonality and hierarchy of authority and the same coefficient between division of labor and procedures), would explain less than half of the variance, and most of them were lower.

Hall also reports that, compared to non-executive levels, executive levels in the organizations he studied operated in a less bureaucratic fashion, in terms of the emphasis on hierarchy, division of labor, procedures and impersonality. At the executive level tasks were usually less uniform and less easily routinized than at other levels. Thus, Hall also found that organizational divisions or departments that specialize in tasks that are non-uniform or difficult to routinize were less bureaucratic in all the dimensions than departments that specialized in more uniform or more routinizable tasks.

It will be advisable, then, to regard bureaucracy as a set of semi-independent and variable principles that constitute the way administrative activities are organized. The major principles to be considered in the present study are centralized authority, standardized work procedures and specialization of personnel. The peculiar configuration of these three variables in a particular organization may account for much of its uniqueness. For example, the group practice of medicine is characterized by highly specialized but uncentralized organizations. On the other hand, school systems and factories probably differ not so much in terms of how centralized or how specialized their personnel are, but in terms of the degree to which their work has been standardized.

The point is that if a particular organization can be organized around several, often divergent principles, the personnel in it can disagree on the legitimacy of each principle. In other words, the conceptions which personnel hold about these variables also can be variable. This assumes that people do not necessarily become "like" the official bureaucracy. The values of workers are not necessarily a reflection of the official system, partly because there are alternative modes within any organization (such as the professional mode) on which to base values. Moreover, even if the bureaucratic role conception were to dominate, it is unnecessary to assume that all people working in an organization would become like the organization because of their different backgrounds, and particularly the ideals that they learned in their training programs. Both of these assumptions seem to be violated by the notion of a "bureaucratic personality" that simply assumes the shape of the official administrative system (40).

Professional Roles

The magnitude of the problems of employed professionals could have been diagnosed from the national statistics. The proportion of white collar workers which are unionized has increased approximately threefold since 1920, while the proportion of professionals in independent practices seems to have grown at a much slower rate during the same period.

Among other things, professionalization is a drive for status. It represents the efforts of a vocation to gain control over its work. Marshall maintains that professional associations were originally formed as a means of wresting the control of a vocation from the state (37). The efforts of teachers and administrators to professionalize similarly have been described as a continued struggle against lay control (55). This resistance to outside influence is no more apparent than in the almost universal rule that the administration should support teachers against outside criticism. As the teacher quoted in the opening of this chapter, told Becker, "Another thing, I don't think a parent should try and tell you what to do in your classroom, or interfere in any way with your teaching..." (4). This statement smacks of the professionalizing ethos that has begun to infect the faculties of many public schools.

Professional-Employee Role Conflict

As a prelude to the presentation of a more systematic model for analyzing conflict, it will be useful to review some of the literature reporting professional-employee conflicts in the various settings.

Years ago sociologists noted the importance of a theoretical distinction between bureaucratic and professional role conceptions, or in other words, ways of defining one's job. Chapin, for example, concluded:

The bureaucrat governs his actions by rule and precedent and obstructs needed changes. The professional man governs his actions in the light of science and learning, and is inventive...It should be evident, from this analysis of the profession, that it offers an avenue of institutionalization of personality that contrasts favorably with bureaucracy (15).

Marshall, however, believes that the fact that professionals are being employed by large scale organizations merely represents a shift in the form of their organization and that the change has not resulted in any real conflict (37). According to Marshall's analysis, the earliest view was that occupations should be judged according to their compatibility with the good, aristocratic life; therefore, they were evaluated in terms of their effect on the giver of the service rather than the recipient. The high-status occupations, the professions, were occupations in which a man had freedom to choose his own standards of behavior according to his beliefs about what is right, rather than what is profitable. But as times changed, and the professions became less leisurely and more commercialized, they were no longer exclusively aristocratic occupations; the professional had to admit that his job was laborious. Yet, his status was saved by the fact that his was a special kind of work -- a service to others. Consequently, occupations came to be evaluated by their effect on the recipient of the service.

Marshall believes, then, that professional organizations were formed to protect the profession from state control on the one hand, and from commercialism on the other. Professions originally provided a way of maintaining a spirit of intense individualism against outside and encroaching control. As he sees it, the real enemy of professionalization is the state and the commercial world, and not administrators who are neither representatives of the state nor commercially minded.

The transformation of the professional from an independent, free-thinking person to an employee of the state, he explains in terms of the changing social service ethic. Social services were first aimed at relief -- they did not aim at permanent change which would weaken the incentive for self-help. But as he correctly observes, with the rise of humanitarianism and a strong middle-class reform movement which arose in reaction to the increasing problems of urbanism, the democratic spirit became stronger and it was the environment, not the individual, which became the focus of attention. Consequently, the professional was employed by communities to perform these new community services. His source of income was derived from his status as an employee of the community rather than from individual clients. Marshall concludes that the individualistic bias originally associated with professions was merely a product of circumstances and not a cornerstone of professionalism. Consequently, while professions are being weaned from their individualism to a social service ethic, he interprets the trend as a change in the form of professionalism rather than a threat to it.

It appears to this writer that in identifying two major sources of threat to professional autonomy, Marshall has overlooked the basic fact that it is autonomy over the professional sphere which is fundamental to professional authority. Most contemporary professions have curtailed excessive commercialism in many respects, it is true; and it is true that the efforts of some professions to divorce themselves from political control have been relatively successful. However, with bureaucratic employment, professional autonomy is threatened from other sources -- from administrative control and from the pressure that laymen can exert over community employees. Marshall has underestimated the role that administrators

do play as representatives of the state (or in the case of public schools, of the local government) which hires them. Contrary to Marshall's implicit assumption, it is not only the state that threatens professional authority; any form of lay control is a threat. Marshall's analysis does not do justice to the role which professional autonomy from all forms of outside control has played in professionalization. Subordination to administrative policy in complex organizations can be as damaging to that autonomy as can state control.

Wordwell's analysis provides further reason to believe that conflict between professional and employee roles does exist (61). He notes three types of organizational roles which potentially conflict: professional roles, executive roles, and labor roles. He observes that several roles have increasingly come to include executive roles within them. But the principle of delegated authority, characteristic of bureaucracy, is inconsistent with the idea of professional authority, which is independent of the sanctions applied by a particular association. Furthermore, with the integration of bureaucratic and professional roles, relationships with clients become increasingly impersonal, altering the intimacy which was the traditional basis of the professional relationship.

The incongruity between the professional roles of physicians in the military and the bureaucracy in which they operate, has been noted by McEwan (39). He realizes that the professional research person's self-conception as an individual capable of critical ability, capacity for originality and thought could only be superficially followed in the structure of the military organization. There was a noticeable incongruity between the professional and military roles of persons trained in research. They interacted with officers on

an equal basis in the research laboratory in the morning, but carried the officers' groceries in the afternoon. McEwan believes that the bureaucratic principles on which the military is organized, such as standardization of positions and superordination-subordination by rank, are in practice completely incongruent with the need for creative thinking and the equality relations that prevail between professionals.

Getzels and Guba have also studied some of the role conflicts expressed by military officers who were instructors (27). They investigated three hypotheses: role conflict is a function of the number and magnitude of incompatible expectations placed upon or held by the actors; the greater the intensity of the actor's involvement in role conflict, the greater his relative ineffectiveness in at least one of the roles; the intensity of an actor's involvement in role conflict is systematically related to personal and attitudinal characteristics. Intensive two hour interviews were obtained from fourteen officer-instructors representing all teaching units and all military ranks from lieutenant to colonel. Their complaints, frustrations and dissatisfactions were identified. Other interviews were conducted with the administrative personnel of the military school studied. One of the major conflicts occurred between the officer role and the teacher role performed by military persons in a military school. In general, the empirical findings support the theoretical expectations.

Further evidence of conflict among professional and bureaucratic roles is reported by Brown, who found that professional employees of a government laboratory resisted rules made for them by persons outside the professional group (12). The project engineer was not only

responsible for technical problems, but as section head, he was the general supervisor of a group of individuals. These roles were easily confused. The author concludes that professionals in the laboratory studied had some interests and values which conflicted with bureaucratic procedures. Persons concerned with research seemed to hold these most strongly. Many of the engineers in development and testing work had resisted adapting to large-scale bureaucratic organization, although they recognized the need for it more than did the research scientists. However, even those who did generally accept the need of bureaucratic procedures showed some resistance in their attack on the Civil Service System, management policies, and committee organization.

Some individuals resisted the organization by identifying with their professional colleagues outside of the laboratory. This served to insulate them from internal friction as well as to provide them with a stronger reference group. In other words, by maintaining their professional loyalty, they were able to reduce the bureaucratic-professional role conflict. The author suggests that groups of professionals who have lower national prestige than engineers would not be able to control their organizations as well as this group did.

Gouldner observes that the fact that an administrator frequently supervises and evaluates employees who are technically specialized, and sometimes professionalized is a basic source of organizational tension (30). Assuming that there are two different types of criteria for the legitimation of authority in a large-scale organization, technical knowledge and incumbency in the office, often the superior, wishing results, emphasizes achievement; the subordinate, on the other hand,

concerned about his peers' judgments of his technical or professional competence, stresses quality in his procedures. The superior's inability to judge his subordinate's competence also poses the problem of whether the criterion for promotion should be seniority and loyalty to the school, or professional skill and competence. Since administrative superiors are not always competent to judge the specialists under them, they tend to rely on the way other people outside the organization evaluate their subordinates. This poses a dilemma: on the one hand, the expert is expected to be loyal to the organization, and on the other hand, the expert's primary identification is with groups outside the organization.

In general then, professional experts who are employed by large-scale organizations may expect to encounter conflicts between the expectations of the organization and their profession. But, the relative emphasis on employee and professional roles varies from organization to organization. Gouldner, Bendix and others suggest that in some organizations knowledge is more basic to the authority system than in others (6,30). In such organizations, employees are permitted more influence over decisions and more initiative and professional autonomy. Other organizations seem to be primarily organized around the principle of compliance, which is opposed to the principle of professional authority. Etzioni maintains that line authority in professional organizations, like universities, does not extend into the professional spheres (22). There is, for example, probably less time spent in direct supervision of personnel in such organizations. However, there is also an extreme degree of variability in such organizations, which suggests that the amount of professionalism which organizations permit will vary even among organizations of the same institutional area.

The existence of conflict in professional and employee roles has played a crucial part in compromising the traditional form of bureaucracy. Mary Goss describes clearly delineated dual lines of authority which she found to exist between physicians and administrators in a medical hospital (29). On the one hand, the administration had the right to make some administrative decisions, such as scheduling and chart review, and the right to give advice; however, physicians reserved to themselves the right to accept or reject administrative suggestions about patient care. It was up to the physician who is actually taking care of the patient to make the final decision. Physicians interpreted the official right of the administrator to supervise as the right to "advise" rather than to make decisions. This consulting relationship was made even more bearable because the administrative positions were held by highly respected and qualified physicians, who were respected by the professionals under them. Whether or not the physicians complied with the advice that they disagreed with, depended almost entirely on whether physicians considered the sphere of authority in question to be "administrative" or "professional" in nature.

Following administrative regulations was not very important to physicians when these regulations conflicted with their professional task of taking care of patients. This does not mean that they never complied with administrative decisions, or that they wanted to make all the decisions. On the contrary, by complying with the decisions of administrators in strictly administrative spheres, physicians gained freedom from administrative responsibility, which they considered to be onerous. Goss concludes that although the hierarchical organization of the hospital in which professionals worked might

appear to conflict with the essence of professional autonomy, in practice the hospitals she studied avoided this conflict through adherence to separate spheres of professional and administrative authority (29).

Professional-Employee Role Conflicts Applied to Teaching

There is reason to believe that the problems of employed professionals which have appeared in other areas are also in effect in public school teaching. Indeed, the public's confusion over the professional status of teachers is reflected in a recent New England study (54). Ninety-one per cent of the people ~~included~~ in that survey said that teaching is a "profession," but only half of them placed it in the same category with acknowledged professions such as medicine, law, dentistry and pharmacy; eleven per cent ranked teaching with labor and service work.

Gross and his associates have reported that role conflict is prevalent in public education. Various publics frequently disagree considerably on corresponding duties (31). A random sample of 105 superintendents and their school boards in Massachusetts often disagreed between themselves (inter-position dissent); members of each school board also disagreed among themselves on specific role obligations (intra-position dissent). The role consensus between the two groups was low on sixty-three percent of the items tested. In general, school board members and superintendents each assigned greater responsibility than the other to their own position. It was particularly apparent that the two groups felt different obligations to the community; their citizen and their specialist positions diverged. For example, school board members felt less strongly than superintendents that a definite stand should be taken against unreasonable demands of taxpayers; while superintendents

believed that they had the right to take such a stand, they were not granted the equivalent right by their superiors. The two groups also advocated different relationships with teachers. For example, superintendents agreed more often than school board members that they must help teachers get high salaries; but school board members did not accord them the same right to request them. Both groups also disagreed among themselves; but there was greater consensus within the superintendents sample, probably because superintendents are elected by more standardized procedures than are school boards.

The same study shows that many of these conflicts involve professional and employee roles. According to Gross's findings, superintendents are often at the mercy of school boards that control their jobs (31). Although most of the one hundred and five Massachusetts superintendents in the study agreed that there are some cases in which the superintendent can exercise his own judgment with respect to school board rules, 34 of them ~~said that following rules~~ strictly is the only way they can keep out of "hot water" with school boards; and 64 of them said that school board rules are absolutely binding on the superintendent.

School board members in that study repeatedly behaved in ways which superintendents considered to be unprofessional. For example, while most superintendents felt that a professional board should act as a unit rather than as individuals, in fact 20 per cent of them reported that individual members of their boards gave them orders at their own discretion without the sanction of the entire board. A similar proportion reported that members of the board gave orders directly to the superintendent's own subordinates. Also, while most superintendents considered "block voting" by school board

members who represent various special interests of the community to be unprofessional, one fourth of them reported the practice. Superintendents will have difficulty acting professionally themselves when their own superiors violate the professional roles.

An even greater dilemma occurs when superintendents are themselves requested by their employers to behave unprofessionally. Nearly a fourth of the superintendents in the Massachusetts study reported pressures from school board members to award school contracts to certain firms in an unethical manner. Also, a fourth of the superintendents reported that school board members placed pressures on them to hire and dismiss teachers because of personal interests or prejudices. In such cases, where a person's job and his professional integrity are both at stake, the professional and employee roles are clearly at odds. At least a fourth of the superintendents in Massachusetts were forced to choose between professional and employee expectations on these issues alone. When it came to the choice, the Massachusetts sample were predisposed toward employee self conceptions: fifty-seven per cent of them said that they believed the superintendent should carry out decisions of the school board even though he believes they are unsound, and about the same proportion said that they actually do carry out unsound decisions.

Robert L. Peabody compared school employees, police officers and welfare workers on the degree to which each group stressed each of two logically opposed bases of authority: (1) the formal (bureaucratic) authority of position, and (2) professional authority based on technical competence (46). He found that elementary school teachers, 75 per cent of whom had graduate training and belonged to two or more professional organizations, stressed professional competence as a basis of authority much more than did either police officers or welfare

workers. In fact, it was concluded that the most striking contrast between these three groups was the relative importance that the elementary school teachers attached to the authority of professional competence. Almost half of the twenty-two school staffs singled out this basis of authority, as compared to 22 per cent of welfare workers and 15 per cent of the police officers. Yet, the typical reaction to conflict was acquiescence to authority of position, particularly among the less experienced members of the sample.

From extended interviews with forty-one teachers in four school systems in two states, Getzels and Guba have identified three areas of role conflict in teaching: the socio-economic role, the citizen role, and the expert, or professional role (27). The "socio-economic" role conflict involves the idea that although communities expect teachers to maintain the same standard of living as other professional persons, their salary is too low to enable them to do so. The "citizen" role conflict includes the idea that communities exercise more surveillance over the conduct of teachers than they do over other professional groups. The "professional" role involves the professional-employee role conflict. The teacher's authority is constantly encroached on by the administration or the public. A sample item included is, "While many parents expect the teachers to discipline their children as well as to educate them, these same parents are often resentful of the disciplining methods employed, even when those methods are justified."

Those items in the Getzels-Guba instrument on which variability between schools was low were considered to be "situationally independent;" items were considered to be "situationally variable" if there was relatively greater variability among schools than the situationally independent items; and they were considered to be

"situationally specific" if the overall mean of the schools was low in comparison with a high mean on one or two of them.

An analysis of the personal backgrounds of the teachers in the sample also showed that role conflict was associated with the teachers' social position outside of the school. There were differences in the patterns of role conflict between male and female teachers, between those with one dependent and those with none and more than one, between those who held part time jobs and those who did not, between those who perceived the community in which they taught as different from that in which they came, etc.

Bidwell studied the incongruence between teachers' and administrators' definitions of administrative roles in connection with teachers' job satisfactions (9). Three types of statements were included in a questionnaire administered to one hundred and two teachers in seven schools: those pertaining to "hierarchic" administration (where authority is attached to offices), those dealing with "democratic" administration (where authority is delegated upward to the administrator by the staff), and "outer oriented" administration (where clients are considered to be the source of authority, experts existing to satisfy clients). A Q-sort technique, balanced block design consisting of six categories was used; respondents were asked to select one-third of the statements with which they felt in most agreement and to reject one-third with which they felt in least agreement. It was hypothesized that convergence of expectations and perceptions regarding administrative behavior would be accompanied by expressed satisfaction with teaching. Among the high satisfaction schools, there was no significant difference between the respondents' perceptions of how administrators acted and their expectations of how administrators should act. But among the

schools with low satisfaction, the expectations diverged from perceptions of how administrators did behave; the divergence was associated with the expression of dissatisfaction with teaching. Incongruence between expectations and perceptions, or in other words, the deprivation of expectations in practice, is undoubtedly a significant type of role conflict, one that will be dealt with in the present study.

A Model for Analyzing Professional-Employee Role Conflicts

With the preceding review of the literature on professional-employee role conflicts as background, the two types of role segments will be outlined more systematically. The point of departure in comparing the roles must be the irrevocable facts of organization. Of course, at the outset it must be recognized that there are many similarities and much overlap between professional and bureaucratic expectations. Both professionals and bureaucrats, as Blau and Scott have pointed out, are expected to be impersonal and detached in order to facilitate rational judgment (11). Both are specialized in their training, and their authority is limited to a special area of jurisdiction. In both cases they are evaluated on the basis of their performance, their competence and their training. However, beyond these basic similarities lie equally important differences between what is expected of professionals and bureaucrats, on which the following discussion will focus.

The major differences between professional and bureaucratic roles are outlined in Figure 3-1. In accordance with the preceding discussion, a complex bureaucratic system can be visualized as a set of partially independent variables pertaining to the three major characteristics of bureaucracy: the degree to which the work is

standardized, the degree of centralized decision making, and the degree of specialization in the work performed. Each of these characteristics may be visualized as a separate continuum progressing from highly bureaucratic at one extreme to highly professional at the other (see the accompanying figure). The location of a complex organization along each of these variables will provide a point of departure for analyzing its role patterns. The opportunity that organization affords its personnel to act professionally and the amount of pressure that it exerts on them to behave as employees depends on the configuration of these variables. Thus, the more centralized, standardized, and the less specialized the work, the greater will be the pressure on personnel to act according to the expectations of employees rather than of professionals.

The conceptualization in Figure 3-1 pertains to the characteristics of organization. It is not an attempt to classify individuals, who may hold conceptions of their roles which diverge from the existing pattern of organization.* But there are obvious parallels between these characteristics of organization and the role conceptions of people who work in them. Therefore, in anticipation that contrasts in organizational patterns will be reflected in role conceptions, the contrasts in professional and bureaucratic models will be outlined now.

First under bureaucratic principles of organization, the work

*In fact, it is possible for the same individual to uphold both professional and employee role conceptions simultaneously by the mechanisms of segregation described earlier. Thus, a group of teachers can be classified in four ways on the basis of their professional and employee role conceptions. First they may subscribe simultaneously to "high professional" and "high employee" expectations; or "low employee -- high professional" expectations, or they may be indifferent to both (low employee -- low professional expectations). Each of these types must then be analyzed in connection with the organizational context in which they must operate.

Figure 3-1

CONTRASTING CHARACTERISTICS OF PROFESSIONAL AND
EMPLOYEE MODES OF ORGANIZATION

Continuum*	Bureaucratic-Employee Expectations		Professional Expectations	
	High	Low	High	Low
Standardization	Stress on uniformity of clients' problems.		Stress on uniqueness of clients' problems.	
	<u>Routine of Work</u>			
	Stress on records and files.		Stress on research and change.	
	<u>Continuity of Procedure</u>			
Specialization	Stress on efficiency of technique. Task orientation.		Stress on achievement of goals. Client orientation.	
	<u>Monopoly of Knowledge</u>			
	Rules stated as universals or rules specific.		Rules stated as alternatives of rules diffuse.	
	<u>Specialization on the Basis of Function</u>			
Authority	Skill based primarily on practice.		Skill based primarily on knowledge	
	<u>Specificity of Rules</u>			
	Decisions concerning application of rules to routine problems.		Decisions concerning professional policy and unique problems.	
	<u>Responsibility for Decision-Making</u>			
Authority	Punishment centered administration.		Representative administration.	
	<u>Centralization of Authority</u>			
	Rules sanctioned by the public.		Rules sanctioned by powerful and legally sanctioned professions.	
	Loyalty to the organization and to superiors.		Loyalty to professional associations and clients.	
	Authority from office.		Authority from personal competence.	
	<u>Basis of Authority</u>			

*Read each of the variables listed opposite the major continua as follows:

- (1) on the left hand side of the dotted line, employee expectations are on a scale from "high" (on the left) to "low" (on the right).
- (2) on the right hand side of the dotted line, professional expectations are measured on a scale from "high" (on the left) to "low" (on the right).
- (3) note that the professional and the employee variables are treated as separate variables, each ranging from high to low.

is standardized. Particular offices are assigned standard administrative routines and solve standard problems. By contrast, professional status is based on a common but specialized body of knowledge; in order to apply the knowledge effectively, the professional is given final authority and responsibility for his decisions, and he is expected to use initiative and imagination to solve clients' problems, which are often unique. Thus, both the assembly line worker and the surgeon are specialized, but the degree of initiative expected of each in solving problems is quite different. Furthermore, the bureaucratic emphasis on files and records only reinforces the idea of routine continuity and stability of the organization while emphasis on the professional's decision making authority and responsibility for research reinforces the value of the new, **unique** and change.

Second, by virtue of the more standardized nature of their work, bureaucrats have less autonomy over their work than do professionals. Abstract and specific rules and procedures regulate bureaucratic work for the sake of efficiency. help to coordinate highly specialized functions; because each bureaucratic situation is presumed to be categorical and routine, a set of uniform rules are applicable. But because the situations dealt with by professionals are assumed to be unique, professional service to clients is primarily based on the special capacity of the professional to solve his own problems. Therefore, efforts by the administration to standardize professional responsibilities challenges professional authority.

Finally, the relationship of the worker to the goals of the bureaucratic organization differs from that of the professional organization. As Francis and Stone state it:

"The emphasis in the professional mode rests upon the relation of an individual to the system of organization... (while) the bureaucratic mode of organization seems to stem from the relation of the individual to a specialized type of work" (24).

The worker's goal of efficiency in the bureaucracy is parallel to the professional's goal of service to clients in the profession. In other words, while in bureaucratic organizations the worker's primary concern is to do his special job, he has no particular responsibility for the total product. But in the professional type of organization, the worker's primary responsibility is to serve the welfare of his clients. It is true that the professional's responsibility is also limited -- i.e., he is responsible only for those problems that are within his area of competence. But he is not only responsible for the clients' total welfare pertaining to that area (e.g., his health or his legal status), he is also concerned with every other facet of his client's life that may effect the type of welfare for which the professional is responsible (e.g., his former relations or his work when they are affecting his health). The client's welfare is not always equivalent to the welfare of the organization. In such instances, professional and bureaucratic principles may conflict, leading to a conflict of loyalty between professional standards and the employing organization.

Of course, these are ideal types and they do not usually exist in pure form; the characteristics of each are not necessarily exclusive and contradictory. Nevertheless, a situation in which both sets of principles are emphasized may demand that both types of principles be compromised.

The development of instruments to measure each of these variables which distinguish professional and bureaucratic organizations

is the central concern of the present study. However, before proceeding to that task, the component characteristics of each of the three major variables just alluded to will be elaborated further as each applies to the public schools.

Standardization of Teaching

Routine Uniformity. A professional is responsible for his clients as individuals; presumably, he is engaged to help solve their unique problems. However, two characteristics of the modern school system prevent complete realization of this ideal. One is the increasing class size, which is now over 35 pupils per teacher in one-third of the classrooms in the country. The concept of "individual differences" has little relevance to the teacher who meets 150 or more students each day. The other is the practice of standardizing courses, course requirements and examinations, all of which is to implicitly ignore the personalities of students.

The tendency in the public schools is toward regimentation of curriculum content on a nationwide basis, uniform textbook selection on a system-wide and state-wide basis, prescription of course by law, the utilization of mass produced educational television programs (by which the same classroom material can be dissiminated throughout the country), widespread use of standardized tests, and the standardization of training requirements for teachers.

Impersonality and Interchangeability. By design, standardization renders an accomplishment independent from the particular person who did the work. Thus, as standardization increases, the indispensability of workers decreases. In bureaucratic systems, relationships are not only impersonal, but persons in the equivalent positions are considered to be entirely interchangeable. (While this is becoming true of professionals as well, professionals at

least maintain the ideology that they have the right to choose their patients and that personal acquaintance with clients and with the history of their clients' problems is important.). Thus, employees are transferred from place to place, and "assigned" to jobs by the administration. The administration determines whether a worker is qualified and needed to do a particular job. On the other hand, the principles of professional organization hold that qualifications can be accurately assessed only by other specialists in the field and the professional himself must ultimately determine what is necessary to do.

While it has been commonly recognized that bureaucracy is in many ways incompatible with individualism, the conflict between the individual and the organization is not the fundamental organizational problem, as important as its implications are for the value system of the society. The fundamental organizational problem is that standardization does not encourage creative and original thought which is so necessary if organizations are to adapt to a changing environment. While from the long run perspective organizations must be adaptable as well as predictable, from the short run perspective in which administrators and workers see their daily problems, predictability often appears to be more convenient, and therefore preferable to change and the application of new ideas. Thus, in this sense, the very function of organizations, which is assumed to be to provide a predictable work setting, can undermine their own effectiveness, which often requires change and improvement. As a result, many of the new ideas that do get implemented within the established framework are mediocre, while the more fundamental ideas are either forced to find recognition outside of the established framework, or their sponsors must be prepared to fight to overcome resistance

from within the organization. Mediocrity often prevails; Goodwin Watson, for example, finds that teamwork is the setting for much mediocrity in academic institutions, and that teamwork is a poor substitute for creativity (59).

Continuity of Procedure. The professional role stresses change and variety in knowledge and techniques. Research, the underlying means by which knowledge is advanced and technique modified, reflects the focus which professions place on variety and change. It is essential for most modern professions. While teachers are slowly beginning to adopt a research orientation, less than \$25,000,000 is spent annually for educational research (36). Comparing education with large-scale industries and government, which profitably spend three to six per cent of their total budget for research, this means that education, a \$15,000,000,000 enterprise, should be spending \$450,000,000 to \$900,000,000 annually. However, local systems refuse to pay for theoretical research which promises to solve no immediate problem and the benefit of which is presumably for everyone. Even many "laboratory" schools which were originally designed for experimental research have virtually abandoned the cause of research.

Much of the time which teachers might be spending on research is devoted to administrative routine which includes record keeping, taking lunch money, maintaining student record files, attendance taking, etc. Estimates indicate that most teachers spend one and one-half to two hours each week keeping records (42).

Authority

Rules. Both professionals and employees operate under systems of rules. However, the system of rules which guides professionals is much less specific and more abstract, or diffuse. Moreover, the

rules which guide professionals are stated as alternatives, while those that govern employees are often unconditionally binding. For example, rules stating that teachers must be in the building by 8:30 a.m. and may not leave the premises without the permission of the administration define them as employees. However, professional organization limits the responsibilities of professionals to their clients and permits alternative ways of serving them; a teacher who remains at home to prepare lessons until her ten o'clock class, or who leaves early to go to the library after her classes and appointments are completed may be a "poor" employee, but she is conducting herself professionally.

Since professionals operate under a rule system too, it must not be assumed that all rules are necessarily detrimental to professional status. On the contrary, in the sense that rules provide a structure which supports the professional and provides him a means to carry out his decisions, rules can enhance his power. This is essentially the conclusion reached by Moeller, who studied the relationship between bureaucracy and the teacher's sense of power (41). Eight judges who were familiar with the 20 school systems in Moeller's sample rated the schools in terms of the clarity of their divisions of labor, the presence of a hierarchy of authority with carefully prescribed responsibility, a system of rules or policy, impersonality, and emphasis on technical qualifications and efficiency from a technical standpoint. The twenty school systems, varying in size from thirty-seven to seven hundred full time teachers, were then ordered in terms of these judgments along a bureaucratic scale. Approximately twenty elementary and twenty secondary teachers from each system were sent questionnaires, to which 692 teachers responded. A scale was developed to elicit the teacher's sense of power

in terms of ability to influence and change policy decisions made by the administration.

It was originally hypothesized that bureaucracy in school systems induces in teachers a sense of powerlessness to affect school system policy. However, the hypothesis was not confirmed. On the contrary, teachers in bureaucratic school systems expressed a significantly higher sense of power in all analyses of subgroups than did teachers in less fully bureaucratized systems. In high bureaucratic systems, it was found that teachers who reported personal ties with the administration were significantly higher in their sense of power than those lacking such ties. In smaller school systems with less bureaucracy, the incidence of particularism was greater, but it held no apparent significance for sense of power. Also, in the bureaucratic systems, only among teachers with long service was there a significant relationship between sense of power and the positions of influence which they held, such as committee chairmanships. In low bureaucratic systems teachers did not see positions of authority as a route to power. Nor was there any apparent relationship between the degree of bureaucracy in the system and the repressive authority exercised by the administration over teachers. The sense of power was, however, directly associated with teachers' organizational membership (particularly in the local teachers' association), the social status of their parents, and their length of service. Male elementary teachers expressed a sense of greater power than other teachers.

Moeller concludes that in less bureaucratized systems, particularism and lack of policy are typical. Many decisions are made without the benefit of a comprehensive and uniform set of rules for the entire system. He concludes that only in orderly, understandable

and predictable organization can any individual expect to influence the direction the organization will take. If the teacher knows what the prescribed course of action and lines of communication are, and what the policy is on the particular issue, he or she will be in a much better position to influence the events than if it is not possible to predict what action the administration will take. The assurance of a policy is in itself, in other words, a form of power.

A certain degree of caution must be used in interpreting Moeller's conclusions based as they are on a sample of school systems. It is quite probable that the variability of schools within a system is as great as variability between systems. However, Moeller's interpretations do provide a needed precaution in making preliminary interpretations of the relationship between rules and professionalism.

Decision-Making Responsibility. The degree of authority that personnel have to make decisions in an organization is a crucial variable separating professionals from employees. But autonomy is also a crucial factor in the job satisfaction of most types of employees. For example, using experimental laboratory groups, Trow found that the job satisfaction of a person in a task oriented group is directly associated with the autonomy of the position that he occupies in the information flow (56).

The more centralized the decisions and the greater the degree of hierarchical supervision, the greater the emphasis on discipline and compliance, and the less initiative that personnel can take to fulfill their professional responsibilities.

However, while professionals as a group seek autonomy in their spheres of authority, this does not mean that each individual has the right to make an independent judgment. That right is primarily reserved to the professional group. This means that what

professionals do is strongly regulated by their colleagues. The supervision of employees, however, is not the responsibility of their peers, but of administrative authorities at higher echelons.

Teachers have virtually no control over many important standards of their work. As Lieberman is fond of pointing out, they have little control over the subjects to be taught, the materials to be used, the criteria for deciding who should be admitted, retained, and graduated in the schools, the forms to be used in reporting pupil progress, school boundary lines and criteria for permitting students to attend, qualifications for teacher training and other characteristics that affect teacher status (36). They have little voice in determining who is qualified to enter teaching, non-professionals being in primary control of the state boards which set standards for teaching certificates. A few years ago, Lieberman reported that there were only five states in which all or a majority of state teacher licensing board members were required to be teachers, whereas physicians, attorneys and dentists represent a majority of such boards in all states, and even barbers and beauticians represent a majority of such boards in forty-four and thirty-eight states respectively (36). Teachers are not represented at all on such boards in a majority of states, ten of which expressly exclude professional educators from state licensing boards. Teachers do not control important phases of their classroom work either. In 1950, the adoption of textbooks was in the hands of state boards of education in sixteen states, only two of which were required by law to have a majority of educators on the board. In 1949, the state boards of education had responsibility for adopting courses of study in thirty-one states, not one of which was controlled by educators. Even where textbook adoption and curriculum is in the

hands of local authorities, the decisions are often made by the administration or by a supervisory staff with little or no consultation of effective influence from the teachers concerned. The meager authority of teachers is reflected in the hierarchical relationship between teachers and their administrators. The "chain of command" locates authority in the administrative rather than in the professional sphere. In this sense, the typical school system is probably not "representative," but "punishment centered." The decisions are made or reviewed at levels of authority above teachers.

Basis of Authority. Blau and Scott point out that one of the major dilemmas of modern organizations concerns the dual basis of authority on which they are typically founded. As they put it, "On the one side, it was administration based on expertise, while on the other, it was administration based on discipline" (11). The dilemma they pose is between compliance and expert judgment: one of the major characteristics of employees is their willingness to suspend their own judgment and follow the directives of their superiors.

Solomon's paper on professional persons in bureaucratic organizations presents one of the most systematic outlines available of the major incompatibilities between professional and bureaucratic ideologies (51). He correctly observes that bureaucratic and professional organizations legitimate authority in different ways. In bureaucratic organizations, one derives his authority primarily from the position that he holds. He may be competent in a profession (other than "administrative") as well, but the amount of deference that is due to him is based directly on his rank rather than his personal or technical competence. The notion of hierarchical authority on the other hand is not central to professional

ideologies. It is true that there is a status system (from interns to chief resident physicians in hospitals, e.g.), but the status is presumably based on superior professional knowledge and competence rather than on official position in the organization. As Solomon observes, in bureaucracies the superior has the right to the last word because he is the superior, while in professional matters the last word goes to the person with greater knowledge or the more convincing logic.

This dual basis of authority sets up tension-producing competition for the professional's loyalty. The loyalty that he is expected to show to outsiders -- his professional colleagues and his clients -- can undermine his loyalty to his employing organization. Blau and Scott report, for example, that the social welfare workers who are the most oriented to their profession tended to be less attached to the welfare agency, were more critical of its operations and less confined by the administrative procedures (11). The present writer found a similar attitude expressed by professionally oriented teachers in collegiate schools of nursing (18).

Solomon points out that while it is the obligation of professionals to serve the best interests of their clients and to provide them with needed services regardless of other considerations, employees are expected to take a course of action that will advance the interests of the organization; they are expected to avoid behavior that is inconsistent with organizational goals. Even if it were assumed that in most cases organizational goals do not conflict with the ideals of serving clients, there are obvious cases in the public schools where the organization's welfare or students' welfare are opposed, as for example, in the case of consolidation which requires the complete destruction of an organization for the welfare of its clients.

Solomon concludes that professionals working in bureaucracies are confronted by two conflicting reference groups to which they look for guidance: their organization and their profession. For example, he says, "it must be the rare battalion medical officer who, in a doubtful case, has not pondered whether to declare the man unfit for duty and risk the ire of his commanding officer, or to satisfy the commander and take the risk with the man" (51). Carr-Saunders continues "The school teacher, for instance, can be devoted to his pupils but he is limited in what he can do for them, since he must follow his employers' views on the matter or lose his post" (14).

But while professionals are committed to serve their clients and the society in general, this fact does not give clients and laymen the right to influence their decisions. They jealously guard their authority from clients and from laymen. Professionals must answer to their colleagues, not to laymen, who are usually regarded with a certain air of inferiority and suspicion. Lay control is the natural enemy of the professions, and one of the very reasons for the profession's existence. This, of course, puts the professional teacher, hired by a lay school board and charged to carry out the "will of the community," in an ambivalent position indeed. Professionals employed in public institutions, then, soon develop extreme sensitivity to public pressures. At the same time they develop strategies for resisting the intrusions and requests of laymen. In this regard, from a study conducted in a dental school, Quarentelli reports that students who were more strongly committed to a specific profession were more sensitive to lay criticism of the profession, but strongly disciplined and committed students tend to qualify, discriminate, and rationalize lay criticism (47).

Professional-employee role conflicts sometimes infect the relations among colleagues as well. One problem is that a person can be a "good" employee without being either known or respected by his professional colleagues in other parts of the state. But on the other hand, most teachers cannot expect to advance too far up the hierarchy of their own school system without losing their identity as a classroom teacher; they must enter administration. Thus, the status system is so structured that teachers are encouraged to exchange their professional status for a bureaucratic office in order to achieve a formal sense of advancement.

The argument over merit and seniority as a basis for advancement reflects the professional-employee conflict in the public schools. While many teachers consider themselves to be professional in one sense or another, the fact is in the vast majority of schools, they are advanced on the basis of their seniority in the system, i.e., their loyalty to the system, rather than their demonstrated professional competence.

Specialization

Basis of Specialization. As the public schools have specialized there have been increasingly fewer teachers responsible for the "whole" student. This problem is greater for the higher grades, where teachers are frequently hired to perform very specific functions, making it nearly impossible to hold individuals responsible for the total development of the students as "persons" or for the failures in this development. But, while it has become very difficult to assess a particular teacher's contribution to either the short-term or the long-term effects of education, his efficiency is more easily assessed. By contrast to the surgeon, who is evaluated on whether or not the operation saved the patient's life (rather than

the length of time it took him), the teacher and the student are often judged primarily on the basis of their "progress" -- i.e., how efficiently they teach or learn. The "good" student is one who learns the subject matter in a semester, just as the "good" teacher is one who can "cover" the subject matter in a specified period of time. The "good" teacher is also expected to maintain discipline in the classroom, perhaps largely because an undisciplined and disorganized class is inefficient. The extent to which efficiency pervades the classroom is revealed in a study by Getzels and Jackson who report that teachers prefer the non-creative student to the creative one because the former creates fewer disruptions in the routine and is more obedient (26).

Monopoly of Knowledge. One of the major differences between craftsmen and professions is the degree to which the former have specialized in terms of techniques and methods. While professionals must be skilled in the use of a variety of techniques, the major emphasis in their training is on an organized body of knowledge rather than on methods. The stress that has traditionally been placed on methods in teacher-training programs places teaching close to other crafts. On the other hand, specialized training in the psychology of learning, the history and philosophy of education, the sociology of education, or in the case of administrators, in administrative science, is more in accordance with professional education. Only if education finds a body of knowledge (as opposed to techniques) to monopolize, will it gain professional authority and recognition. Teachers and students who advocate that less stress be placed on the academic basis of teaching in favor of more actual classroom experience and practice are advocating what amounts to training for a craft rather than for a profession.

IMPLICATIONS

Whether or not teachers are essentially professionals or employees is one of the most crucial questions that the modern educator and parent must face. The way it is answered has important implications for how teachers are to be treated by the public and how much authority is to be delegated to them by the administration.

As teachers professionalize, it may become apparent that the separation of professional and administrative spheres of authority, which has been observed in some hospitals may well have a great deal of relevance for alleviating the professional and employee role conflicts in the public schools as well. The segregation of administrative chores (such as taking attendance and lunch money) from professional duties has obvious value for releasing the time of teachers for professional matters. But perhaps as important, by separating professional from administrative authority, professional decisions can be insulated from political influence (16). For, the further up one goes in the organization, the closer to politics he is. The superintendent is only one step removed from politics, and quite often not that. One of his functions seems to be to prevent politics from prevailing the organization. However, if he has authority over professional standards, there is always the danger that the administrator will be tempted to strengthen his organization or his own position by bargaining them away. By giving teachers that authority, the decision will be somewhat more isolated from direct political pressures (16).

Undoubtedly, when more than one line of authority exists, struggles will arise between groups to gain control over the organization. In the schools three lines of authority seem to be emerging: one through laymen (the school boards), another through administrators, and the

third through various teachers' organizations. There are many conditions which determine which of these groups will dominate, but among them the configuration of two organizational variables is important. The complexity of the organization is one of these variables; the other is the degree of technical specialization that employees have achieved (45). The more specialized the employees are, the less competent are administrators to supervise and evaluate them. Specialization gives employees power. On the other hand, the more complex the organization, the greater is the need for internal coordination, which enhances the power of administrators whose primary internal function is coordination. When neither condition exists, laymen tend to control. The simultaneous existence of both conditions is fertile soil for conflict between the administrators and the teachers.

In addition, school boards, teachers or administrators may be either locally or cosmopolitan oriented. The pressures on teachers and administrators to behave as employees, and their opportunity to be professional are associated with the school's position along a continuum ranging from one dominated by locally oriented school boards to one dominated by cosmopolitan oriented teachers (see Figure 3-2 below).

Figure 3-2
FORMS OF CONTROL AND TYPES OF BUREAUCRACY

FORMS OF CONTROL AND TYPES OF BUREAUCRACY						
FORM OF CONTROL	Type of Bureaucracy					
	Authoritarian			Representative		
Dominant Power	School Board		Administration		Teacher	
Orientation	Local	Cosmopolitan	Local	Cosmopolitan	Local	Cosmopolitan
Teacher Status	Employee				Professional	
(continuum)	(Maximum)				(Maximum)	

EMPIRICAL STUDIES OF FRICTION INCIDENTS

By contrast to the amount of speculation about conflict in organizations and to the volume of research that has been reported on role conceptions and role conflicts, there is a paucity of analytical research on overt friction incidents and even major conflicts that have occurred in organizations; and the difficulties in studying conflict in organizations have not provided much incentive to an otherwise neglected research problem. Among those who have studied conflict, case materials and direct observation of limited samples have been common approaches. A number of case studies of conflict in schools, for example, have been reported in various sources. The University of Alabama Press has published a growing series of case studies, several of which pertain to the public schools. The University Council of Educational Administration case studies series contains reports of detailed descriptive accounts of several conflicts that have occurred in the public schools. Culbertson, Jacobson, and Reller's case book describes a number of episodes involving administrative conflicts, as does Sergeant and Bailse's (20,50). In addition, the Office of Education periodically publishes abstracts of legal cases in which teachers have been involved, called "The Teacher's Day in Court."

Haas has observed and interviewed work groups in two hospitals about friction incidents that occurred during the course of one five day work week (32). The number of incidents ranged from 1 to 37 on different wards or stations. The type of incidents which Haas reports includes criticism, complaints against other persons, arguments and talking derogatorily about someone when he is not present. Among them, for example, was an argument between a doctor and a nurse about filling out orders for medication and upsetting the

nurses' schedules; a head nurse ordered a nurse to perform a task which she thought was properly the physician's responsibility; a nurse was receiving too many personal calls at the hospital; one nurse consistently arrived at work ten or fifteen minutes late, and so on.

A direct rank order correlation of .71 between the number of incidents and size of the work group was reported. The rank order correlation between the degree of consensus among work group members on their work roles and the number of friction incidents reported on the station ranged from .8 to 1.00; i.e., the proportion of the group involved in friction was greater when there was low consensus among them. On the other hand, the correlation of the amount of friction between pairs of individuals with consensus were not statistically significant. One interpretation of this difference is that friction is often a group affair and not confined to personal resentment between individuals.

While the use of case materials and observations of limited samples allows investigators to explore a wide variety of hypotheses and to gain a perspective on the total situation, the obvious disadvantage is that representiveness or intensive analyses are precluded by small samples. Since in most cases it is not feasible to directly observe several organizations for long enough periods to depict large samples of friction episodes, indirect methods have been relied on by some investigators. The simplest of these is to ask respondents to generalize about their problems. For example, "How much 'tension' is there in the school?" Zald, for example, attempted to measure the amount of conflict in correctional institutions by using this kind of a global measure of conflict (62). Staff members were asked, "On the whole, how much tension is there in the organization between various roles?" Conflict indices were computed by combining the

average amount of tension listed for each diad in the institution. An arbitrary criterion of 30 per cent or more in the "high" or "some" tension categories for either partner to the conflict was considered to represent high conflict for the diad. The first index scores included four judgments of tension made by respondents and the second index included only the amount of tension perceived between employees and the superintendent. He found that the more custodial institutions in the sample have a lower level of conflict than did "mixed-goal" or "treatment" institutions. It was concluded that conflict is most likely between those parties who are unable to control the situation and those who are being perceived as being in control of the situation.

Asking respondents to list their major "problems," which sometimes turn out to include interpersonal problems, or friction, for example, is another alternative. Nathan Stoller and William H. Groves, Jr., for example, have reported such a project (53). Twenty-five principals were asked to list their problems, which were then classified by the investigators into seven major categories: instructional leadership, staff personnel, pupil personnel, provision and maintenance of space and equipment, school-community relations, the principal in the central office, and the principal and the instructional leadership was divided into problems on coordination of instructional activities and into problems on the organization of the content of the instructional program. A relative dearth of problems was noticed in the general area of "instructional leadership," but another study was cited in which over 18 per cent of the problems cited by new principals in middle Atlantic states occurred in the category they call "relationships with the faculty." A study of daily diaries showed that the principals spent less than 8 per cent of their time on child guidance and 5 per cent on the health and

safety of the pupils although in the ideal distribution of their time which they reported, over 27 per cent of their time was allocated to the total of these two functions. The authors conclude that the contemporary principal devotes considerable energy to the provision of space and instructional supplies to the increasing number of students; one of his problems is how to use the schools' facilities for services other than those concentrated in the original design. They also report that their evidence indicates that principals at least think they deserve a greater share in policy setting than they actually get. One of the principal's own personal problems includes the lack of adequate clerical assistance.

However, while these general types of approaches have the advantage of efficiency, respondents are forced to generalize so much that the investigator is allowed little opportunity to check the basis of these conclusions. Furthermore, not only is he forced to rely on the observations and conclusions of respondents, but the investigator is forced to accept the categories in terms of which respondents classify their experience. Attempting to circumvent this last problem, Flanagan used a "critical incident" technique to study schools (23). This is a means of collecting from respondents direct observations of the behavior of their associates. An "incident" is defined as "any observable human activity that is sufficiently complete in itself to permit inferences and predictions to be made about the person." To be "critical" it must occur in a situation "where consequences leave little doubt about the effects, and where the purpose and intent of the act are clear." Flanagan suggests that the advantage of the technique is that only simple types of judgments are required by the observer. If there is a pattern in the events, then, it is the responsibility of the investigator rather than the

respondent to discern it. Reports from only "qualified" observers are included; all observations are evaluated by an observer in terms of an "agreement of the purpose of the activity." Of course, interviewing techniques usually incorporate this principle, but it can be used with questionnaires as well. A modification of the technique is to present respondents with an "incident" that has actually occurred, and ask them what they might do in the situation.

One of the major problems with this method is how to develop a set of categories that do justice to the content of the incidents reported by the respondents; but the advantage of providing records of specific behaviors reported by those who have been involved with the situations makes it a useful research technique.

Perhaps the most notable attempt to date to study actual "trouble cases" in educational institutions is reported by Lazarsfeld and Theilens in The Academic Mind (35). In the late 1950's, near the end of the McCarthy era, 2451 randomly selected social science professors in 165 American colleges and universities (also selected by random sampling procedures) were interviewed and asked to describe instances in the past few years in which their own academic freedom had been threatened in any way, and whether they knew of similar experiences among their colleagues. They were also asked for instances of "civil liberty cases," of "problems" on the campus, and of "local events that had stirred up strong feelings" in recent years. They were asked to recall any occasion at their school when an individual who was of superior ability but "unconventional" had been bypassed for a permanent appointment in favor of another of lower professional merit, whether there have been instances in which they themselves "were being watched in the classroom," and whether they had received pressures to conform politically or whether anyone of the faculty had been accused of being subversive or engaged in unAmerican activities.

The word "incident" was used by the authors to describe an episode, long or short, in which an attack, accusation, or criticism was made against a teacher, group of teachers or the school as a whole. That is, the word denotes an overt act, the making of a charge or a criticism; reports of "considerable tension" did not qualify as an incident unless respondents could add accounts of such incidents. A single episode was considered to be one incident, regardless of the number of teachers involved and of the complexity of the situation. Repeated accusations from the same source, then, were included together.

A total of 990 incidents were identified in the 165 schools. The total number of incidents found at any one school varied from 0 to more than 20, over half of the schools reported 2 to 10 incidents. No incidents at all were reported in 24 colleges, almost all of them among the very smallest in the sample. The largest number of incidents recorded in any one school was 28. The majority of charges made involved political issues. The largest percentage of respondents reporting increased pressures were located in large private universities. About a fifth of the social scientists reported a perceived increase in pressure from alumni, trustees, the community, and legislators or local politicians over the seven years prior to the study. The initial charges were leveled by outsiders (American Legion, state legislature, parents), by students, and by college administrators.

The present study will attempt to incorporate the advantages of the several available procedures. Interview reports, such as those elicited from respondents in the Lazarsfeld and Thøgersen's study will be compared with similar questions incorporated in questionnaires and

with modified critical incident techniques. The results of these investigations will be interpreted in view of the conclusions of the literature reviewed in this chapter and the one that follows.

REFERENCES

1. Argyris, Chris. Personality and Organization (New York: Harper and Bros., 1957), pp. 50-51.
2. Bates, Frederick L. "Position, Role and Status: A Reformulation of Concepts," Social Forces, 34 (May 1956), pp. 313-321.
3. Becker, Howard S. "The Career of the Chicago Public School Teacher," American Journal of Sociology, 57 (1952), pp. 470-477.
4. Becker, Howard S. "The Teacher is the Authority System of the Public Schools," Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 27, (November 1953), pp. 128-141.
5. Ben-David, Jos. "Professional Role of the Physician in Bureaucraticized Medicine: A Study in Role Conflicts," Human Relations, Vol. IV (1958)
6. Bendix, Reinhard. "Bureaucracy: The Problem and Its Setting," American Sociological Review, 12 (October 1947), pp. 502-504.
7. Benne, Kenneth, and Bennis W. "Role Confusion and Conflict Within the Nursing Profession -- What is Ideal Nursing?," American Journal of Nursing, LIV, 3 (March 1959), pp. 380-383.
8. Bennis, W. G. and others. "Reference Groups and Loyalties in the Out-Patient Department," Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 2 (1957-58), pp. 481-500.
9. Bidwell, Charles E. "Some Effects of Administrative Behavior: A Study in Role Theory," Administrative Science Quarterly, 2 (1957).
10. Blau, Peter. Bureaucracy in Modern Society (N.Y.: Random House, 1950).
11. Blau, Peter and Scott, W. Richard. Formal Organization (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962), p. 244.
12. Brown, Paula. "Bureaucracy in a Government Laboratory," Social Forces, 32 (1954), pp. 259-269.
13. Burns, R. K. and Tabb, J. The Salaried Employee and Unionism, as cited by Bernard Goldstein, "Some Aspects of The Nature of Unionism Among Salaried Professionals in Industry," American Sociological Review, 20 (April 1955), pp. 199-205.
14. Carr-Saunders, A.M. "Metropolitan Conditions and Professional Relationships" in R. M. Fisher, editor, The Metropolis in Modern Life, Chapter 15, p. 285.
15. Chapin, F. Stuart. Contemporary American Institutions (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1935), pp. 316 and 311.
16. Cicourel, Aaron, V. "Administrative Science and Education in Urban Society," in Education in Urban Society, B. J. Chandler, Lindley J. Stiles and John J. Kitsuse, eds. (New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1962), pp. 129-146.

17. Corwin, Ronald G. "Role Conception and Career Aspiration: A Study of Identity in Nursing," Sociological Quarterly.
18. Corwin, Ronald G. Role Conception and Mobility Aspiration: A Study in the Formation and Transformation of Bureaucratic, Professional and Humanitarian Nursing Identities (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1960).
19. Corwin, Ronald G. "A Study of Identity in Nursing," The Sociological Quarterly, Vol. II, No. 2, (April 1961), pp.69-86.
20. Culbertson, J. A., Jackson, P. B., and Reller, T. L. Administrative Relationships: A Casebook (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960).
21. Drucker, Peter F. "The Employee's Society," American Journal of Sociology, 58 (1952), pp. 352-363.
22. Etzioni, Amitai. "Authority Structure and Organizational Effectiveness," Administrative Science Quarterly, 4 (1959), pp. 43-67.
23. Flanagan, J. "The Critical Incident Technique," Psychological Bulletin, (July 1954), pp. 327-358.
24. Francis, Roy G. and Stone, Robert C. Service and Procedure in Bureaucracy (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956), Chapter 1.
25. Friedsam, H. J. "Bureaucrats as Heroes," Social Forces, 32 (March 1954), pp. 269-274.
26. Getzels, J.W., "Administration as a Social Process," Administrative Theory in Education, ed., A.W. Halpin (U. of Chicago Press, 1958); also with Jackson, P.W., Creativity and Intelligence (N.Y.: John Wiley & Sons, 1962).
27. Getzels, J. W. and Guba, E. G. "The Structure of Role and Role Conflict in the Teaching Situation," Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 29 (September 1955).
28. Goffman, Erving. Encounters (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1961).
29. Goss, Mary E. W. "Influence and Authority Among Physicians," American Sociological Review, 26 (February 1961).
30. Gouldner, Alvin W. "Organizational Tensions," Sociology Today, Robert Merton, ed. (New York: Basic Books, 1959), pp. 400-428.
31. Gross, Neal. Who Runs Our Schools? (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958).
32. Haas, J. Eugene. Consensus and Disharmony in Hospital Work Groups, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation (University of Minnesota, 1957).
33. Hall, Richard H. "The Concept of Bureaucracy: An Empirical Assessment," The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 69 (July 1963), pp. 32-40.

34. Hughes, Everett C. "The Making of a Physician--General Statement of Ideas and Problems," Human Organization (Winter 1956), pp. 21-25.
35. Lazarsfeld, P. & Theilens, W. The Academic Mind (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1958).
36. Leiberman, M. The Future of Public Education (Chicago: U. of Chi. Press, 1960) also, Education as a Profession (N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1961).
37. Marshall, T. H. "The Recent History of Professionalism in Relation to Social Structure and Social Policy," Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, V (August 1939), pp. 325-340.
38. Marvick, D. Career Perspectives in a Bureaucratic Setting (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1954), p.34.
39. McEwan, William J. "Position Conflict and Professional Orientation in a Research Organization," Administrative Science Quarterly, I (1956), pp. 208-224.
40. Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957).
41. Moeller, Gerald H. "Relationship Between Bureaucracy in School Systems and Teachers' Sense of Power," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation (Washington University, 1962).
42. National Education Association. "The American Public School Teacher, 1960-61," (Washington, D.C.: NEA, Research Monograph, 1963), p. 55.
43. Neiman, L. J. and Hughes, J. W. "The Problem of the Concept of Role -- A Re-survey of the Literature," Social Forces, XXX 2, pp. 141-149.
44. Page, Charles H. "Bureaucracy and Higher Education," The Journal of General Education, 5 (1961), pp. 91-100.
45. Parrow, Charles. "Organizational Prestige: Some Functions and Dysfunctions," American Journal of Sociology, 66 (1961), pp. 335-341.
46. Peabody, Robert L. "Perceptions of Organizational Authority," Administrative Science Quarterly (March 1962), pp. 463-482.
47. Quarantelli, E. "School-Learned Adjustment to Negative Self Images in High Status Occupational Roles: The Dental School Example," Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 35 (1961), pp. 165-171.
48. Reissman, Leonard. "A Study of Role Conception in a Bureaucracy," Social Forces (March 1949).
49. Seeman, Melvin. Social Status and Leadership: The Case of the School Superintendent (Columbus: Bureau of Educational Research, The Ohio State University, 1960).

50. Sargent, Cyril G. and Belisle, E.L. Educational Administration: Cases and Concepts (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1955).
51. Solomon, David N. "Professional Persons in Bureaucratic Organizations," in Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, Symposium on Preventive and Social Psychiatry, (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1957), pp. 253-266.
52. Stogdill, Ralph M. "Personal Factors Associated With Leadership: A Survey of the Literature," Journal of Psychology 25 (1948), pp. 35-37.
53. Stoller, Nathan and Groves, William H., Jr. Reports of Selected Elementary School Principals on Their Professional Problems (New York: CPEA -- Mar Digest Series, Teachers College, Columbia Univ., 1954).
54. Terrien, Frederic W. "Who Thinks What About Educators?", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 59 (September 1953), pp. 150-158.
55. Thayer, V. T. "The School: Its Task and Its Administration - III," in Educational Frontier (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts Co., 1933), p. 220.
56. Trow, Donald B. "Autonomy and Job Satisfaction in Task Oriented Groups," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology.
57. Turner, Ralph H. "Role Taking, Role Standpoint and Reference Group Behavior," American Journal of Sociology, 61 (Jan. 1956), pp. 316-328, as cited by Arnold Rose in Human Behavior and Social Processes (Boston, Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1962).
58. Udy, Stanley H., Jr. "'Bureaucracy' and 'Rationality' in Weber's Theory," American Sociological Review, 24 (1959), pp. 791-795.
59. Watson, Goodwin. "The Problem of Bureaucracy, a Summary," Journal of Social Issues (Dec. 1945), pp. 69-72.
60. Whyte, William F. "An Interaction Approach to the Theory of Organization," Modern Organizational Theory (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1959).
61. Wordwell, Walter I. "Social Integration, Bureaucratization and Professions," Social Forces, 33 (May 1955), pp. 356-359.
62. Zald, Mayer N. "Power and Conflict in Correctional Institutions," Administrative Science Quarterly (June 1962), pp. 22-49.

Chapter 4

THE RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of the present report, as explained in Chapter 1, is to design the questionnaire, to examine the feasibility of various measures and indices of variables, and to instrument and validate the major scales that will be utilized in subsequent phases.

THE SCHOOL SAMPLE

To accommodate this purpose, a heterogenous sample of schools was selected, one that would tend to maximize the variance in the relevant variables with a small number of cases. Seven public high schools were selected to represent a broad range in staff sizes. Six of the seven schools are located in Ohio; one is in Michigan. Since the sample isn't systematically representative of the geographical region, the generalizations must be confined to the pattern of association between variables. The frequency with which these patterns do occur in the American public schools must await a much larger, nationwide sample. Although, as will be reported subsequently, in several respects the present sample does approach regional and national norms.

Selection Criteria for the Initial Sample

Initially, the size distribution of public secondary schools in Ohio was estimated from a tabulation of the number of teachers in Ohio secondary schools (drawn from a thirty per cent random sample of schools listed in the State of Ohio Educational Directory: School Year 1962-63). Every third system was included in the tabulation, and every third high school was included in those systems that had more than two high schools. The distribution was arbitrarily divided into the size categories shown on Table 4-1.

Three or four schools in each size category were randomly selected and invited by letter to participate in the study. A total of twenty-three schools were invited, ten of which agreed to participate (or 43 per cent of the schools invited). Five of the ten schools were induced by personal contacts.* It was possible to include seven of the ten schools in this first phase of the study. The distribution of the sample selection is reported in Table 4-1.

Reasons given by the schools which declined to participate frequently indicated that they were participating in other research projects, or were involved in internal reorganization problems. There is little external evidence to indicate any reluctance to participate because of the nature of the problem studied. However, the matter of selective participation is a crucial one; the possible influence that selective participation may have on the conclusions should be in mind at all times.

The initial letter inviting the schools to participate was sent ("special delivery") to the superintendent of schools; (see Appendix I a). In most cases the letter was forwarded to the principal of the school involved for the final decision. The principal was personally contacted to assure that his cooperation had been received. He was written further details and asked to arrange a faculty meeting during the week of the field work. In some cases,

*In a previous study of role consensus among nurses in 30 hospitals located in cities in six different parts of the country, the present investigator found that the agreement to participate in the study as a result of mailed invitations was also approximately 50 per cent.

Several persons in the College of Education at the Ohio State University generously agreed to make personal telephone calls to school officials in some of the districts included; an additional three schools were added because personal contacts assured easy entry into the school.

Table 4-1
SELECTION OF THE SCHOOL SAMPLE

School Size in Number of Teachers		Response to Invitation to Participate		
Size	Number of Teachers	Agreed to Participate ^a		No Response
		Schools Included in Study ^b	Schools not Included in Study	
Large	100 or more	1	---	---
Medium	55 - 99	2	1	1
Medium	34 - 54	2	1	---
Small	21 - 34	1	1	---
Small	20 or less	1	---	---
TOTAL		7	3 ^c	1

a 43.5 per cent agreed to participate; five of the ten schools were included by personal contact.

b 30 per cent of the schools contacted participated.

c These schools agreed to cooperate, but the impending close of the school year precluded their use in the current phase.

a member of the project staff conferred with the principal by telephone at some length to assure that the general intent of the project and the necessary procedures were understood. In two cases, it was necessary to make a special visit to the school to show the principal the instruments, and to outline in more detail the necessary procedures and the purpose of the study.

Characteristics of the School Sample

Table 4-2 reports the proportionate size distribution of the seven schools in the present sample, as compared to a stratified random sample of schools in Ohio. The one school in the study with more than 100 teachers is approximately representative of the proportion of the largest high schools in Ohio, and there is also a close approximation between the proportion of the schools in the study with between thirty-five to fifty-four teachers and the proportion of schools of this size in Ohio. However, the schools with between fifty-five and ninety-nine teachers are over-represented in this sample, and the schools with twenty or fewer teachers are grossly under-represented; the latter category constitutes 44 per cent of the high schools in Ohio and only 14 per cent of the schools in this study. Moreover, while the mean number of teachers per school in Ohio is approximately thirty, in the present study the mean number of teachers per school is nearly twice that (58); the median teacher in the State of Ohio is in a school below twenty-four teachers, while the median teacher in the sample is in a school with a staff as large as sixty-three teachers. However, the fact that the sample under-represents the small schools in the region is intentional and will not invalidate the intent of the study. The underlying question is whether or not bureaucratization is somehow associated with the incidence of friction and with role conflicts in the public schools.

TABLE 4-2
DISTRIBUTIONS OF HIGH SCHOOLS IN THE STUDY AND IN OHIO SAMPLES,
BY STAFF SIZE

Number of Teachers in High School	Number of Schools in Sample		Percentage of Each Sample Ohio	Study
	Ohio*	Study		
125 and over	1	0	.006	.000
100 - 124	1	1	.006	.143
55 - 99	13	2	.084	.286
35 - 54	37	2	.240	.286
21 - 34	34	1	.220	.143
20 or less	67	1	.440	.143
TOTALS	153	7	.996	1.000

*Based on a Random 30 per cent sample of Ohio Public Schools listed in the Educational Directory for the State of Ohio, 1962-63.

It is not the intent of the present study to determine the frequency with which that relationship is actually found, but to establish its existence and nature.

In view of the rapid growth of the public schools in the recent past; in view of the prospects of continual growth in the near future, there is good reason for choosing a sample that is perhaps more representative of the future than of the present. Already the typical teacher in the United States is in a relatively large school even though the typical school remains relatively small.

THE RESPONDENT SAMPLE

Characteristics of the Teachers

Ninety-eight per cent of the respondents are full time teachers or administrators. The average teacher in the sample comes from a city of nearly 100,000 persons, but 33 per cent of the sample come from towns with a population under 5000. The sample is almost equally divided between persons who have lived before in the community where they are teaching and those who had not lived in their present community before their employment. The sample is 85 per cent Protestant, 10 per cent Catholic, 2 per cent Jewish, and approximately 2 per cent who are not members of a church. The estimated annual income of the average teacher's father is \$6500, with about one quarter of the sample coming from homes where the average annual income is less than \$5000.

The sample is 61 per cent male and 39 per cent female. The average teacher in the study has taught 16.5 years; 21 per cent have taught less than five years and nearly 10 per cent have taught more than thirty-six years. The average number of years in the present system is nearly thirteen, with 30 per cent working less than five years. The average teacher in the sample has taught nearly eleven

years in the present school, but 38 per cent have taught less than five years. On the average, the teachers in the study have taught in two or three systems, but 34 per cent of them have worked only in their present system. Their average (mean) salary is \$6157; 16 per cent earn less than \$5000 a year, and nearly nine per cent earn over \$8000 per year. On the average, the teachers in the sample think that they should be earning more money.

About 37 per cent of the sample report that they have taught one or more courses outside of their college major and 15 per cent have taught one or more courses outside of either their major or their minor. Only a negligible proportion of the ~~sample~~ are not members of a teaching profession, and about one out of every five is a member of a teachers' union. On the average, teachers in the sample say that they devote about six hours a month to reading professional journals, and on the average they report having read about twenty books during the preceding year. But only about 11 per cent of the sample say that they have published articles in professional journals. About 36 per cent have held memberships in community organizations and 30 per cent of them have held offices in these organizations.

The Sample Compared to Ohio and National Norms

Table 4-3 shows the average characteristics of teachers in the sample compared to national and Ohio samples (as reported by the National Education Association, the Ohio Education Association, and the Ohio State Department of Education during 1963). Since these data have been collected for a variety of different purposes, in many respects they are not strictly comparable, but they provide a general benchmark by which to assess the representativeness of the respondent sample.* First, it should be noted that the median age

*In many cases equivalent data were not available for both Ohio and the nation, and in some cases where data were available, they were not available for the secondary level.

AVERAGE CHARACTERISTICS OF TEACHERS IN THE SAMPLE
COMPARED TO NATIONAL AND OHIO SAMPLES

Characteristics of Teachers	Measures of Central Tendency											
	The Nation*		Ohio		The Sample							
	Total ^a	Secondary	Total	Secondary	Total	School Number						
						1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Median Age -- Total Men (Secondary) Women (Secondary)		35.9 33.7 42.6			43.5 43.0 48.0	48.0	48.0	28.0	48.0	43.0	41.0	34.0
Sex Ratio Per cent Men Per cent Women	31.4 68.6	53 47	34.0 ^e 66.0 ^e	58.0 ^e 42.0 ^e (for all certified personnel)	67.6 32.4	46.8 53.2	54.5 45.5	61.5 38.5	66.1 33.9	63.9 36.1	55.6 44.4	60.8 39.4
Marital Status Per cent Single Per cent married Widowed or Divorced		24.3 70.0 5.7			22.4 73.5 4.1	20.6 76.5 2.9	29.8 68.1 2.1	0.0 90.0 9.1	19.2 69.3 11.5	29.0 69.4 1.6	14.9 81.6 3.6	33.3 59.3 7.4
Number of years Teaching Experience-Total Mean	13.4	11.4	12.9	12.2 ^c	16.4	19.9	16.9	6.5	19.0	17.5	15.7	12.3
Median years of college Completed Total		5.1	*4.2 (Mean)	*4.6 ^c (Mean)	5.0	5.1	5.1	5.2	5.1	5.2	5.0	5.3
Men (Secondary) Women (Secondary)		5.5 4.9			6.2 4.3							
Highest Degree Held & less than B.A.	14.6	2	17.3 ^c	1.8 ^c	11.2	16.7	5.0	0.0	11.5	13.5	8.1	11.1

TABLE 4-3 (CONTINUED)

Characteristics of Teachers	The Nation		Ohio		Total	The Sample School number						
	Total	Secondary	Total	Secondary		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(Highest Degree Held)												
% B.A.	61.9	62	65.0 ^c	68.6 ^c	59.9	52.9	46.9	90.9	57.7	59.7	68.9	51.8
% M.A.	23.1	35.1	17.7 ^c	28.4 ^c	29.3	29.4	47.4	9.1	30.8	25.8	23.0	37.0
% F h.D.	.4	1.0		.26 ^c								
Per cent earning addi- tional income (other than rent, royalties, etc.		49.9			57.2	52.9	48.9	63.7	53.8	56.5	65.6	51.8
Median Salary for class- room teachers												
Total	5735	5995		6000	6200	6400	7200	2700	6600	5500	6400	6400
Membership in Teachers' Association												
% Active		55.9			57.6	58.9	45.7	45.4	76.9	69.3	54.1	54.1
% Inactive		41.0			41.0 ^b	38.2	52.1	54.6	23.1	30.7	45.9	45.9
% Not a member		3.1	6.0 ^d		1.4	2.9	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4
Type of Institution Attended												
% Public		65.9			65.7	59.5	54.5	53.8	64.5	66.7	77.8	65.7
% Private		34.1			34.3	40.5	45.5	46.2	35.5	33.3	22.2	34.3

PLEASE SEE FOOTNOTES ON FOLLOWING PAGE TO ABOVE TABLE.

TABLE 4-3 (CONTINUED)

*From the AMERICAN PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHER, 1960-61, Research Monograph 1963. M2 Research Division, National Education Association; (based on a sample of 2104 teachers randomly selected from a stratified random sample of 343 school districts).

- a Reported only where information for secondary schools is not readily available.
- b i.e., Listed member only, dues paying members only, and those who "attend" conferences occasionally in professional associations.
- c The Ohio Education Association Research Report, OHIO TEACHER PREPARATION AND EXPERIENCE, 1963 (April, 1963).
- d Included only certified teachers and administrators.
- e Estimated from TEACHER CERTIFICATION IN 1962, State of Ohio, Department of Education, 1963.
- f for all instructional staff, 1962-63; NEA Research Report Economic Status Teachers, 1962-63.

of the present sample is considerably above the national median. The median teacher in the sample is over seven years older than the median teacher in the nation; women in the sample are almost ten years older, and men slightly more than five years older. As might be expected then, the mean number of years teaching experience of the sample is over four years above the average for the Ohio secondary teachers and five years higher than the national norm for secondary teachers. This fact may contribute to a bias of the findings. Little is known about the effects of age on conflict and role conception; it might be speculated that older persons generally will be relatively resigned to the present situation, but that they will become combative when it is subject to change. Probably more important than mean age is the amount of variance.

In marital status, the present sample is close to national teacher norms. It is slightly biased in favor of men, compared to the sex ratios found in samples of all certified personnel in the state systems in Ohio. The study sample contains approximately 10 per cent more men and 10 per cent fewer women than the state average. The proportion of men in the sample is 15 per cent higher than the national norm.

The median of five years of college completed by the sample is virtually identical with national samples and only slightly higher than the Ohio mean. Men in the sample have completed only slightly more college work than the national average, while women have completed slightly less. There are, however, some differences in percentage holding degrees at different levels. The proportion of teachers in the sample holding M.A.'s is virtually identical with the percentage in Ohio samples with M.A. degrees; but B.A.'s in the

sample are nearly 9 per cent higher than the Ohio average for secondary teachers. But there is almost complete comparability between the present sample and national samples on the proportion that have attended public institutions of higher education, about 56 per cent in both cases.

The proportion of teachers in the sample who are active in teachers' associations is roughly comparable to a study conducted by the NEA, which concluded that about 56 per cent of the teachers in the nation are "active" in a teachers' association. The percentage who are "inactive" (i.e., those who are listed members only, dues paying members only or those who attend conferences in professional associations only occasionally), is virtually identical with the national average of 41 per cent.

The proportion of teachers in the sample earning outside income (other than royalties and rent) is about 8 per cent higher than the national average of secondary teachers. The median salary for teachers in the sample is \$6200, which is above the Ohio and national medians (of approximately \$6000) for secondary classroom teachers.

In conclusion, for a small sample, and one that was not selected by procedures that would guarantee it to be completely representative of teachers in Ohio or the nation, it is in several respects relatively close to national and Ohio central tendencies. The present sample does seriously over-estimate the age and experience of teachers. But on the other hand, it is representative of teachers' marital status, activity in professional organizations, the type of college attended, and years of education completed. There is less than a 10 per cent error in the sex ratio and the proportion without B.A. degrees, and the income of the sample is only slightly higher.

These figures suggest that a relatively representative sample could be obtained with a slightly larger sample size and the use of random sampling techniques.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN

The questionnaire was necessarily long. It took the typical conscientious respondent about three hours to complete. This length was deemed necessary because of the several complex dimensions with which the study deals, and because it was necessary to include in this preliminary phase a variety of alternative scale items and indices for purposes of providing validation and reliability checks. One of the objectives of the present phase is to identify and eliminate items which are unfeasible or unnecessary. Specific items included within the questionnaire will be discussed in subsequent chapters. At this point, only a general description of the overall questionnaire will be provided. The questionnaire is divided into seven parts. (See Appendix II).

Part I. This part asks the respondent for general background information on age, sex, marital status, job history, level and type of education, and professional activity and religious affiliation and activity.

Part II. In this part, the respondent is asked for information about the nature of his work and his general perceptions about it and his associates. For example, it asks about which individuals or groups are most important to the respondent for helping him to make up his own mind in certain matters, his job satisfaction, his career plans, his commitment to the job, his evaluation of courses in the school, his frequency of contact with various officials in the school system and in the community, his perceptions

of his principal's leadership ability, and his classroom practices.

Part III. This part originally consisted of descriptions of twenty-six hypothetical incidents between teachers and the administration that have occurred in different schools throughout the country. The respondent was asked to imagine himself in each situation and then indicate (1) what he would do, and (2) what is likely to happen when such a situation arises at his school. One hypothetical incident appears as an example below:

Because of a shortage of English teachers, a principal requested a history teacher to teach English next year. The teacher refused, stating that he wasn't competent to teach the English course -- imagine yourself as the history teacher:

A. What would you do in the situation described above?
(check only one).

1. comply with superior's request
2. try to compromise
3. seek support of colleagues
4. ask for an investigation by professional organizations
5. refuse to comply with request
6. quit the job
7. other (specify)

B. What do you anticipate will happen to you if you do not comply with the above request? (check only one).

1. no disapproval or mild disapproval from the principal
2. strong disapproval but no formal action from the principal
3. loss of reputation
4. loss of deserved promotion or loss of deserved salary increase
5. transferred to less desirable position
6. dismissal from school system
7. other (specify)

C. Do you think it was right and reasonable for the principal to make such a demand? No _____ Yes _____

This type of scale has been used by several other investigators, including Gross and his associates (1) and more recently by Delbert C. Miller and Fremont A. Schull, Jr. (3). Gross and his associates postulate that when confronted with two conflicting role

expectations, the incumbent either conforms to one expectation or the other, compromises, or avoids the situation. Miller and Schull reject the notion that these responses are due to personality types, suggesting that the person's orientation depends upon the particular role conflict situation.

Part IV. This part originally consisted of a list of sixty criticisms which teachers have expressed of their schools from time to time. The respondent was asked how often, if at all, such situations have happened in his school system (by checking one of the four categories, "very often," "often," "seldom," or "never). Examples of the items include:

Teachers have been hired because of their family and friendships rather than because of individual merit.

There is pressure on teachers to adopt a certain philosophy of education.

Teachers are required to join a professional society against their will.

Part V. This part originally consisted of ninety-six statements to which respondents were asked to indicate how they believe things should be and how they actually are in their school. The respondents indicated the degree to which they agree with each statement by circling one of the alternative responses which range from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree."* These items constitute a series of "subscales" of the professional and of the employee orientation scales, which will be described in more detail in the following chapter.

*Respondents were instructed that "strongly agree" indicates agreement with the statement with almost no exceptions; "agree" indicates agreement with some exceptions; "undecided" indicates that the respondent could either agree or disagree with about an equal number of exceptions in either case; "disagree" indicates disagreement with the statement with some exceptions; and "strongly disagree" indicates disagreement with almost no exceptions.

Part VI. This part is a list of types of decisions which must be made in any school system. The respondent was asked to indicate (1) which official or group should have the final authority to approve or veto each of these decisions in case there is any dispute, and (2) who normally does have the final authority to make each of the decisions in his own school insofar as he knows. The types of decisions considered include selection of required textbooks, establishing required courses, dismissing teachers, allowing permission to outside groups to speak to students, formulating instructional policy, promoting a teacher, the appropriate method of teaching particular courses, assignment of teachers to teach courses, the qualification of teachers to teach courses, etc. The possible individuals or groups that might have authority to approve or veto these decisions include: the individual teachers involved, teachers' professions, the teaching faculty, a group of teachers appointed by the principal, the principal in consultation with teachers, the principal, the superintendent, the State Department of Education, school board members, and committees of parents; an "undecided" category was also included.

Part VII. In this section of the questionnaire respondents were asked to briefly describe as accurately and as candidly as possible two or three incidents or disputes that have arisen among the staff. In cases where names were requested, the respondent was again assured that his responses would be treated in strict confidence and anonymity at all times. All teachers in the school were listed by code number and the respondent was provided with a code sheet and asked to use the code number instead of the name in his answers.

On this part, respondents were also asked to estimate how

much "tension" there is between the several groups in the school: teacher-principal, teachers-school board, teachers-superintendent, teachers-administrative assistants, teachers-department heads or supervisors, teachers-students, and various types of teachers. The possible alternatives range from "severe," "moderate," and "slight," to "none."

Each respondent was also asked to indicate the degree of tension that exists between him and each other particular staff member in the school, using a 5-point scale ranging from "severe" to "none," and "not so well acquainted." He was then asked to estimate the number of open disagreements that have occurred between him and each faculty member since the start of the school year, with a brief description of the dispute.

Finally, on this part, each respondent was also asked to evaluate every other teacher in the school on the criteria of: the teacher's knowledge of his subject, his ability to communicate the subject, and the respect that he has among other teachers. For each of these categories, the respondent was asked to indicate whether the teacher was "excellent," "very good," "average," "fair," or "poor," or whether there was no opportunity to observe.

PROCEDURES IN THE FIELD

The general plan was for the field investigator to spend approximately five days at each school, during which he would administer the questionnaires and interview approximately forty per cent of the faculty about conflict incidents in their school. In practice, this plan was modified whenever it was necessary or feasible. A field worker was in the largest school seven days and one was in the smallest school in the study three days. Some schools were

close enough to the Ohio State University to make it feasible to visit them at several different times during the course of the study.

Questionnaire Administration

Several procedures for administering the questionnaires were experimented with to determine which procedures would provide both efficiency and a productive rate of questionnaire return. In one case, questionnaires were administered during two faculty meetings, each of one and one-half hours in length, held on the second and third days after the field worker had arrived in the school. However, it was found that teachers resented being detained at the school to complete the questionnaire; they preferred to complete it at home. It was more effective to use the faculty meeting for the purpose of distribution the questionnaires, providing detailed instructions for filling them out, and for providing a general orientation to the general nature and intent of the project; this helped to establish rapport between the field workers and the faculty. The questionnaires were then distributed to the respondents, accompanied by a letter (in Appendix I), describing the project and assuring them that their responses would be treated with strict confidence. The completed questionnaires were returned before the end of the week, at which time respondents were re-assured that their questionnaires would be returned directly to the Ohio State University for analysis.

Another approach was tried in the 119 teacher school. Before the field investigator arrived the questionnaires were sent to the respondents' homes with a letter of explanation. The respondent was asked to return the questionnaire during the following week when the field investigator would be at the school. It was assumed that this procedure would provide respondents with more time to complete the

questionnaire. However, it was found that they had little incentive to complete it until after the faculty meeting with the field investigator.

Attempting to reduce the amount of time in the field, a third approach was tried in the 89 teacher school. The questionnaires were distributed at a faculty meeting, and the respondents were asked to return them by mail in a stamped, self-addressed envelope which was provided.

The rate of questionnaire return for the schools by size and by method of questionnaire administration is listed in Table 4-4. It appears that the most effective method of administering questionnaires required the investigator to remain at the school long enough to collect them. The response was very low (only 30 per cent) in the one school in which the respondents were asked to mail back their questionnaires. Mailing the questionnaires in advance of the field investigator's visit does not seem to be particularly helpful.

Interviewing

The general plan was to secure a thirty or forty per cent sample of the faculty at each school. A total of 34 per cent of the teaching staffs of the schools studied were actually interviewed. In practice, it was both necessary and feasible to deviate from random sampling procedures whenever respondents could be located who were reputedly "knowledgeable" about their colleagues' informal relations and about their school's affairs. This sample selection procedure, in other words, incorporates a "search" procedure by which leads about incidents are investigated and an attempt is made to locate clues and persons involved.

The interviews lasted approximately thirty to forty-five minutes each. Respondents were asked to identify their colleagues

RESPONDENT SAMPLE

School Number	Number of Teachers on the Staff ^a			Number of Questionnaires Returned by Schools for Each Part							Per cent responsible to Part I, based on the total no. of teachers	Number Interviewed	Per cent Interviewed ^c
	Total No.	Full Time	Part Time	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
1	33	25	8	31	31	28	31	29	27	31	.94	15	.45
2	53	50	3	46	46	40	39	31	35	41	.87	26	.49
3	20	18	2	11	11	11	11	8	10	11	.55	15	.75
4	47	35	12	25	25	22	24	24	24	25	.53	7	.15
5	63	60	3	60	60	57	56	56	49	60	.95	40	.63
6	119	119	0	86	85	84	81	79	79	86	.72	28	.24
7	89	89	0	27	27	24	27	27	27	27	.30	12	.13
All Schools	424	386	28	286	284	266	267	252	249	279	.6	143	.34

^a Based on a Principal's Report to State Department of Education

^b 77 agreed to participate

^c In most cases, those interviewed had also completed questionnaires

by code number from code sheets that were provided, similar to the procedure used with the questionnaires. Nearly all of the respondents were cooperative in being interviewed. Only a few persons refused to discuss either the friction incidents or the parties involved. Most interviews were tape recorded.

The interviews were loosely structured. The field investigator was encouraged to pursue the discussion in whatever direction seemed most relevant and productive. In all cases the interviewer was asked to describe "friction incidents" in which he has been involved or known of.

Problems

During the course of the interviews, and informally during the interviewer's stay at each school, respondents were given an opportunity to comment on the questionnaire. As expected, the major criticism concerned its length. This length, necessary in this preliminary phase of the study, undoubtedly increased the rate of no response, and it conceivably could have affected the accuracy of at least some of the answers. Some respondents complained that the time pressure in answering so long a questionnaire did not permit sufficient opportunity to ponder the full implications of each question.

Other criticisms concerned what were essentially the respondents' suspicions of questionnaires in general. As David Reisman found in his observations on the interviewing in connection with the study of The Academic Mind, some respondents refused to "play the game" of interviewing (2). Reisman found that reservations on the value of questionnaires were quite common, amounting up to 15 per cent of the respondents in two parts of the sample. One of the specific objections expressed to Reisman, and also found in the

present study, is the respondents' feeling of frustration at the questionnaire's forced choice items. However, to such objections Reisman notes, "In reflecting about this whole converse of objections, I recognize that some are valid, and yet I am struck with the number of respondents who refuse, whether intermittently or throughout, to play the game of the interview. In a sense, they took the matter too seriously, in believing, for instance, that it mattered whether they had been at their present institution six or seven years. What was wanted of them -- as it appeared to me as a respondent -- was a general estimate of the climate of freedom that is felt to them, and not an annotated dissertation."

Chapter 4

REFERENCES

1. Gross, Neal, Mason, Ward S., and McEachern, Alexander W., Explorations in Role Analysis (New York, 1958), pp. 281-318.
2. Lazarsfeld, Paul F. and Thielens, Wagner, Jr., The Academic Mind (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1958), Methodological Appendix, p. 304.
3. Miller, Delbert C. and Schull, Fremont A., Jr., "Administrative Role Conflict Resolutions," Vol. 7, Administrative Science Quarterly (September 1962), pp. 143-160.

Chapter 5

DEVELOPMENT OF THE INSTRUMENTS

SCALE CONSTRUCTION

Three major scales have been developed for purposes of this investigation: a professional status orientation scale, an employee status orientation scale, and a scale of the initiative and compliance expressed by teachers in response to hypothetical friction incidents.

Professional and Employee Scales

It was initially assumed that professional and employee roles can be conceptualized and fulfilled independently; a subsequent analysis, reported in this chapter, bears out this assumption. Therefore, a separate set of items has been identified for the professional and for the employee orientation, and each scale was independently tested for internal consistency, reliability and validity. Each of the major scales includes several subsets of items, some of which can be used as "subscales" and others as crude "indices" of the separate professional and employee role segments that comprise the teacher's status relations with respect to the administration, the public, professional colleagues and students.*

The professional and the employee conception scales were developed in a series of stages during which items were progressively selected from a large volume of items which had been compiled from an extensive review of the literature over the past several years. The initial items were collected from a variety of sources. The literature on "trouble" cases in public education was reviewed, and a growing body of literature on the "professional employee" in various institutional settings was screened. A content analysis

*Literally, roles pertain to interaction between positions. The teacher-public role, for example, cannot be fully comprehended unless the public's expectations of teachers are compared with teachers' expectations of themselves. However, a representative sampling of each counter-role is beyond the scope of this study; only the teacher-teacher and teacher-administrator roles can be compared. Instead, it has been necessary to focus on the variability of teachers' conceptions of the counter roles.

was also made of 244 legal cases reported by the NEA brought by teachers against public school systems between 1958 and 1961*. Altogether, approximately 250 distinct items, representing various dimensions thought to be of possible relevance for one or the other of the two scales, were suggested from these sources.

Judging the Items

These items were then judged by the project staff for "face" validity, and checked for possible duplications of intent or statement, and for ambiguity. Approximately one half of the items appeared to be relevant and clearly stated and were retained. Next, several professional colleagues generously consented to judge the items. They were instructed to place each item into one of eleven general categories, representing possible "subscales" of the major scales. Each category was in turn divided into a "high" and "low", making a total of twenty-two categories into which judges were asked to place approximately 130 statements. Five categories represented what were initially regarded as related subsets of the total professional conception scale; the other six categories represented subsets of the proposed employee conception scales. The judges were instructed to discard all items which they could not classify. The definitions of the categories which were provided to the judges are described in Figure 5-1.

On two sets of items -- uniqueness of teachers' and students' problems, and interchangeability and standardization of work -- the judges distributed the items almost randomly between the high category of one and the low category of the other. Upon inspection, it

*About 35 per cent of the cases involved tenure rights, and about the same proportion concerned contract, salary, or retirement. There were fifteen cases of loyalty, fourteen cases on liability for pupil injury, thirteen cases on eligibility and certification and three cases involving collective bargaining.

appeared that these two categories could be considered to be opposite statements of the same continuum. Accordingly, they were combined (under the "standardization" heading).

At this juncture, the items on which six of the eight judges had reached consensus were retained. Thirty-one items were thus eliminated by the judges. The remaining ninety-six items are listed in Appendix IIe ("Questionnaire," Part V).

Respondents were instructed to answer each statement in one of five ways: "strongly agree," "agree," "undecided," "disagree," and "strongly disagree." The responses to each item were weighted from 1 to 5. The scale scores must be interpreted in the context of the scale in which they appear. The direction in which responses have been weighted depends on the content of the item and the scale in which it is incorporated. In the professional scale, a high score indicates a high orientation. In the employee orientation scale, on the other hand, a high score denotes a low employee orientation, while a low score denotes high employee orientation. Thus, in either scale, the lower score denotes a position which is logically further removed from the professional orientation.

Tests of Internal Consistency

The responses of the total sample to each of the items in each scale have been analyzed for internal consistency, using critical ratio and scale value difference procedures. The method of internal consistency as a criterion of the scalability of an item is based on the assumption that the power of each item in the scale is a function of its ability to discriminate between those respondents whose total scores place them on either extreme of the scale. That is, if it can be assumed that the total set of items is differentiating between groups which are theoretically different in some important way, then the test of internal consistency determines which of the items in the total set account for most of the discrimination.

Figure 5-1

DESCRIPTION OF SUBSCALES FOR EMPLOYEE AND PROFESSIONAL SCALES
EMPLOYEE STATUS ORIENTATION SCALES

Orientation "Subscales" (Or Indices)

Administrative orientation. A statement should be included in this category when it implies that teachers should try to please the administration and comply to official requirements.

Loyalty to the organization. A statement should be included in this category when it implies that teachers should subscribe to a practice because it contributes to the welfare of the school in which they are employed.

Competence based on experience. A statement should be included in this category when it implies that on-the-job experience is the basis of teaching competence or is a requisite for improving teaching skill.

*Interchangeability of personnel and standardization of work. A statement should be included in this category when it implies that it is the teacher's obligation to fit into the system. (This includes the notion that teachers should be shifted around the system as the need arises, that education is the responsibility of the system rather than of the individual teacher, and that progress in courses should be standard throughout the system and state.)

Work described in terms of rules and procedures. A statement should be included in this category when it implies that rules and formulated procedures are important for defining teachers' work roles and responsibilities.

Public orientation. A statement should be included in this category when it implies that the teacher's primary obligation is to the lay taxpayers and parents of the local community.

PROFESSIONAL STATUS ORIENTATION SCALES

Orientation "Subscales" (Or Indices)

Client orientation. A statement should be included in this category when it denotes that a teacher's conduct is to be guided primarily by concern for the students' welfare. Items in this category include those which describe the degree of the teacher's commitment to his students and his feeling of responsibility for their welfare.

Orientation to the profession and to professional colleagues. A statement should be included in this category when it implies that teachers should be loyal to the profession and its ideals and practices.

Competence based on monopoly of knowledge. A statement should be included in this category when it implies that improved teaching requires increased education, professional training and research.

*Uniqueness of the professional and his clients' problems. A statement should be included in this category when it implies that teachers are unique and have their unique methods, and that students have unique problems, learning capacities and needs.

Decision-making authority and control over work. A statement should be included in this category when it implies that the individual teacher or a group of teachers and teachers' organizations are responsible for the major decisions that control their work, such as the selection of textbooks and of curriculum, etc.

* These two categories were eventually collapsed under the employee scale, because the judges almost randomly exchanged the items intended for these two scales.

The first step is to eliminate items which do not significantly discriminate between the high and low extremes of the sample. To determine this, the responses of those respondents whose total scale scores are in the upper quartile of the total distribution have been compared on each item with those who are in the lower quartile of that distribution. The scale value differences (SVD) between these two groups of respondents was then computed for each item and tested for significance of difference by means of the critical ratio test. Those items on which there was no statistically significant difference have been excluded from further consideration.

Actually, most of the scale value differences were significant. In order to identify those items that were contributing most to the total scale difference, the maximum possible scale value difference was computed for each item; this is the mean difference between those respondents who scored the highest and those who scored the lowest on that item only. Then, for each item, the proportion of this maximum scale difference that was achieved by the groups that were at the extremes of the total scores has been computed; this is the ratio of the maximum difference (computed between the groups at each extreme of each item) to the actual difference for each item (computed between the groups at each extreme of the whole set of items). This percentage is called the "scale value difference ratio" (SVDR). It signifies the power of the item to discriminate in the total scale relative to its power to discriminate as a single item. The higher the SVDR, the closer is the actual SVD to the maximum theoretical value difference.

Both the critical ratios and the SVDR's were computed for (a) each item in the subscale (using the responses scored at the high and the low quartile on each subscale), and for (b) all items against

the total scale scores. Appendix IIe reports the scale value difference ratios and critical ratios on each item in both the subscale and in the total scale. To be accepted, an item had to meet two criteria. First, the critical ratio for both the total scale and subscale comparisons of the item must have reached at least the one per cent level of significance (on a one tail test, since direction was predicted). Second, it was necessary for the scale value difference ratio of the item to reach at least .32* on both the subscale comparison and the total scale comparison. Definite preference was given to items that were considerably above this level (only four of the forty-five final items are below .35 on the total scale).

Scale Reliability

Within each scale, the items that were tentatively accepted for each scale were then randomly divided into two sets and each set was correlated with the other. Table 5-1 reports the split-half reliability for the total scales and for the "subscales." The split-half correlation for the twenty-nine items in the employee orientation scale is $r = .74$ ($N = 257$), which, when corrected with the Spearman-Brown prophesy formula is $r_n = .99$. The split half correlation for the sixteen professional orientation scale items is $r = .48$, which, when so corrected, is $r_n = .99$.**

*The criterion for selecting and rejecting an item on the basis of the SVDR is at present somewhat arbitrary. Theoretical distributions have not been developed. The criterion which has been used ranges from .50 to .30. Professor Bullock, who is now doing research on this method, suggests that the SVD magnitude might compensate for lower SVDR's, and that a variety of SVDR's might be preferable to a single minimum level, since variety would identify both gross and refined differences in a sample.

**While the split-half correlation for the professional orientation scale is lower than for the employee scale, the professional scale has fewer items. Therefore, the split-half correlation technique considerably underestimates the reliability that would be achieved by the total scale, until the correction factor is applied. Consequently, the correction formula is considered to be a more accurate estimate of the reliability. See William J. Goode and Paul K. Hatt, Methods in Social Research (McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1952), p. 236.

Table 5-1

SPLIT-HALF CORRELATIONS OF SCALE RELIABILITY
FOR PROFESSIONAL AND EMPLOYEE SCALES AND "SUBSCALES"
(N = 257)

Type of Scale	r	r _n [*]
EMPLOYEE SCALE:		
Total Scale Split-Half Correlations (29 items)	.74	.997
Subscales		
1. Administrative Orientation (7 items)	.69	.996
2. Loyalty to the Organization (4 items)	.67	.996
3. Experience (2 items)	.21	----
4. Interchangeability (4 items)	.43	----
5. Rules and Procedures (6 items)	.55	.993
6. Public Orientation (6 items)	.74	.997
PROFESSIONAL SCALE:		
Total Scale Split-Half Correlation (16 items)	.48	.994
Subscales		
1. Client orientation (3 items)		
Items 64 and 65	.54	----
Items 64 and 66	.22	----
Items 65 and 66	.50	----
2. Colleague Orientation (6 items)	.50	.992
3. Monopoly of Knowledge (4 items)	.18	----
4. Decision Making (3 items)		
Items 90 and 91	.90	----
Items 90 and 93	.36	----
Items 91 and 93	.40	----

*The Spearman-Brown Prophecy Formula was used. See Wm. J. Goode and P. K. Hatt, Methods in Social Research (McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1952), p. 236.

Since there were so few items in some of the "subscales," it was not expected that they would all show a high degree of reliability. However, on three of the "subscales," (all of them in the employee scale), the reliability is .67 or above, which exceeds $r_n = .99$ when the correction formula is applied. The split half correlations on three other "subscales" are between .65 and .43 (uncorrected). The reliability of at least four of the very short "subscales" is unacceptably low for them to be considered sub "scales." Separate item correlations were computed between the three "client orientation" items. They are correlated, but the correlations (especially between items 64 and 66) are not particularly high. A similar situation exists for the "decision-making" items; the correlation between two of the items is extremely high; the correlations of these two items and the other one are modest.

It is concluded that the split-half reliability of the total scales is acceptable. However, while several of the "subscales" also meet normal standards of scale reliability, some of them are so unreliable and contain so few items that they do not qualify as scales in any sense. They might be viewed as crude "indicators" of complex variables; i.e., while they will not place respondents along a continuum, they may be profitably used to rank order respondents among themselves. For most purposes in the study, the following subsets of items will be treated as "subscales": administrative orientation, loyalty to the organization, and public role orientation. For some purposes, orientation to rules and procedures and to colleagues will be treated as scales (if they prove to be reliable on test-retest analyses in subsequent phases of the project). The other subsets of items will be regarded as indices of ordinal position rather than scalable measures.

Validating the Scales

After the scale items were selected, the problem of the "validity" of the total scales had to be faced. It is customary to validate attitude scales against "known" groups, or in this case, against groups of persons who are reputed to act like "good" and "poor" professionals and like "good" and "poor" employees would be expected to act.* Persons in the sample who qualify as either "high" (good) or "low" (poor) employees and professionals were identified. The criteria that were used to identify the "known" highest and lowest professionals and employees in the sample are listed in Figure 5-2 and are discussed below.

The High and Low Employee Groups. Several criteria were used to select the two groups that were used to validate the employee status conception scale. First, principals' evaluations of the teachers were used. The principal of each school was asked to rate his teachers as employees on the following criteria: (1) loyalty to the administration, (2) loyalty to the organization, and (3) utilization of standard work procedures. The inter-correlations between the three types of rankings are respectively, $r = .78$, $r = .79$ and $r = .81$. With correlations of this magnitude, any one of them seems to be a reasonably reliable predictor of the others. The principal's evaluation of "loyalty to the administration" was selected as one of the primary indices of employee conduct. Respondents who received "excellent" from the principal on this evaluation were considered to have demonstrated high loyalty to the administration. Those who ranked "poor," "below average," and "average," were considered to be

*The underlying assumption is that attitudes correspond to overt behavior. It should be noted in passing that this assumption can be debated. Also, a question almost as important as their "validity" concerns the significance of the scales -- i.e., whether or not they correlate with, and discriminate between, other important variables; to determine this is, of course, the objective of the following two years of the study. Some information on this question is reported in the following chapter.

Figure 5-2

PROFESSIONAL AND EMPLOYEE BEHAVIORAL INDICES

Variable	General Class	Specific Measure	Response
Professional Conduct	Development of Professional skills (knowledge)	Type of Training: High Professional	Normal-school trained excluded
		Low Professional	Normal-school trained retained
		Years of Education: High Professional	5 or more
		Low Professional	4 or less
		Subscription to Professional Journals: High Professional	Yes--2 or more
		Low Professional	1 or less
		Time Devoted to Reading: High Professional	Less than 5 hrs. per wk.
		Low Professional	
		Commitment to Teaching: High Professional	Full time only
		Low Professional	Part time incl.
Employee Conduct	Loyalty to the Administration	Published Articles: High Professional	Yes-2 or more
		Low Professional	No
		Active in Professional Associations: High Professional	Officer, active on committees, or contributor to meetings
		Low Professional	Dues paying member only, or less
Employee Conduct	Loyalty to the Administration	Loyalty as Evaluated by the Principal: High Employee	Judged Excellent
		Low Employee	Judged poor, below average, or average
Employee Conduct	Loyalty to the Administration	Critical to the Administration (and of the school):	

Figure 5-2 (continued)

Variable	General Class	Specific Measure	Response
	Loyalty to the Organization	High Employee	One or more standard deviations below mean of criticism checklist
		Low Employee	One or more standard deviations above mean of criticism checklist
		Readiness to Leave: High Employee	Would not leave for a salary up to and including \$3000 increase
		Low Employee	Would leave at a lower salary or an increase up to and including \$2000
		Number of Days Absent: High Employee	Five or fewer days
		Low Employee	Six or more

"low" on this dimension.*

The readiness of employees to leave the organization was used as a second criteria. Respondents were asked to answer the following questions: "Would you leave your present job for an equivalent or better position -- at a better salary?...at the same salary?...at a \$500 per year salary increase?...at a \$1000 per year salary increase?...and at a \$3000 per year salary increase?" Respondents who would not leave for a salary raise up to and including \$3000 were classified as "high" in organizational loyalty, while those who would leave at a lower salary or a salary increase up to and including \$2000 were classified as "low" in organizational loyalty. (The \$3000 category was a frequent choice, and so was excluded).

All of the respondents who qualified on one of the extremes on either of the above criteria were subjected to two further tests: criticism of the administration and the school, and absenteeism. Their criticism of the administration and the school was assessed from Part IV of the questionnaire, which consists of a checklist of criticisms (to be discussed subsequently) about the administration, the school board and the school in general. Those respondents who qualified as good employees on the evaluation criteria were retained in the "high" validating group if their average score of criticism toward the administration's misuse of authority, toward the school in general, or to the total checklist, was over one standard deviation below the mean of the total sample. Those respondents who were otherwise judged to be "poor" employees on evaluation were retained in that group if their average criticism scores

*Those ranked "average" by the principals were included in the "low" category because of the skewed distribution -- i.e., few respondents were rated below "average." Respondents who were evaluated as "good" were omitted from this dichotomy.

were one or more standard deviations above the total sample mean.

Finally, those respondents who qualified on the organizational loyalty criteria were retained in the "high" category of organizational loyalty if they had reported having been absent five or fewer days during the year, while those who were absent more than five days were classified in the "low" category.

Then, to have qualified for either the high or low group, respondents must have been high or low on either (1) evaluation and criticism, or (2) organizational loyalty and absenteeism.

In this way, forty-four respondents were included in the high employee validating group; the low employee validating group consists of nineteen respondents. The mean employee scale score difference between the high and low groups is $\bar{X} = 11.3$ (Table 5-2).^{*} The t-test of significance of difference between mean is $t_{62} = 2.48$, which is significant at $P > .01$ (one tail test). The total scale, in other words, discriminates between groups whose reported behavior would otherwise classify them as "high" (relatively good) employees and "low" (relatively poor) employees.

^{*}The mean difference between the few who scored consistently high or low on three of the four categories is greater, $\bar{X} = 12.2$; but the small sample size precluded using statistical tests on this more stringent selection criteria.

Table 5-2

SIGNIFICANCE OF MEAN EMPLOYEE AND PROFESSIONAL
ORIENTATION SCALE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN HIGH
AND LOW EMPLOYEE AND PROFESSIONAL
VALIDATION GROUPS

EMPLOYEE VALIDATION GROUPS	N	Mean Employee Scale Score ^a	Test of Significance
High Criterion Groups	44	77.3	
Low Criterion Groups	19	88.0	$t_{18} = 2.48^*$ (High vs. Low)
"Known" group-High Prof.	19	96.2	
PROFESSIONAL VALIDATION GROUPS		Mean Professional Scale Score ^a	
High Criterion Group	29	53.1	
Low Criterion Group	30	48.4	$CR = 10.7^*$ (High vs. Low)
"Known" Group-High Prof.		60.1	

^a For the employee scale, higher scores indicate lower orientation. For the professional scale, higher scores indicate higher orientations.

* Significant at $P > .01$ (one tail test).

Professional Validating Group -- High. The high professional group consists of all full time classroom teachers with five or more years of education, who have gotten most of their training in colleges and universities other than state normal schools or teacher's colleges, and who subscribe to two or more professional journals. In addition, on the grounds that some types of professional behavior are important whether or not all of the above conditions are met, persons were included in the high professional validating group if they have published two or more articles, or have held an office in a professional association, have been very active on committees, or have presented papers to one or more programs in association meetings.

The Professional Validating Group -- Low. Included in this group are all full time and part time respondents educated in all types of institutions who subscribe to no more than one professional journal and who report reading professional journals less than five hours a week.* Those who have published two or more articles have been excluded from the group, as have those who have been officers or very active in professional associations; many of those included are not members of professional associations, or are only dues paying members or attend professional conferences only occasionally.

Twenty-nine respondents have been included in the high professional validating group and there are thirty in the low professional group. The mean difference between the total professional conception scores of these two groups is 4.7 points. The critical ratio of significance is, $C.R. = 10.7$, which is significant well beyond

*The specific procedures adopted to make the above selection were dictated partially by the requirement of maintaining a reasonable sample size. Therefore, in one respect, the set of criteria used to select the validation groups is not strictly dichotomous: respondents who reported reading professional journals less than five hours a week were not systematically excluded from the high group (because the sample size precluded it). This might be justified on the grounds that reading may be a sufficient, but it is not a necessary condition of professionalism.

the 1 per cent level (on a one tail test). The scales, in other words, discriminate between groups identified as high professional and as low professional in conduct.

In addition to the above groups, the scores of another group reputed to be highly professional also are reported in Table 5-2. This is a group of teachers on the faculty of a State University laboratory school, all of whom have advanced degrees and are technically part of the University faculty. Their mean scale scores on the professional status conception are seven points higher than even the high professional validating group selected from the sample, and their scores on the employee role conception are 6.2 points below the low employee group which was selected from the sample. These data provide further confirmation of the ability of the scales to make consistent and accurate identifications.

Further Analysis of Professional and Employee Scale Scores

The mean professional and employee scale scores of the respondents in each school are reported in Table 5-3. An analysis of variance of the mean scores on each scale for the seven schools is also reported in Table -3a and 5-3b. The differences among the mean employee scale scores for the seven schools are significant at $P > .01$. That is, the employee scale differentiates among the schools in the sample. However, the analysis of variance for the mean professional scale scores does not show a statistically significant difference among the total set of schools. But, there is a statistical difference between the mean of the most professional school (school 3) and the least professional school (school 2) ($t_{41} = 2.1$; significant at $P > .05$); this difference promises that the scale will have more discriminative power in a larger (and more diverse) sample of schools.

Table 5-3
MEAN PROFESSIONAL AND EMPLOYEE
ORIENTATION SCALE SCORES, BY SCHOOL

SCHOOL	PROFESSIONAL SCORES	EMPLOYEE SCORES
Code Number	Mean ^a	Mean ^b
1	57.2	77.3
2	57.0	84.1
3	61.1	81.1
4	56.5	80.4
5	57.2	80.9
6	57.1	74.9
7	57.9	86.3
TOTAL SAMPLE	57.3	79.3

^a High mean indicates higher orientation
^b Low mean indicates higher orientation

Table 5-3a

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE MEAN PROFESSIONAL
SCALE SCORES FOR THE SEVEN SCHOOLS

	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F Ratio
Means	31,739	6	25.5	F = 0.008
Within	818,347	250	3,147.5	Not sig-
Total	850,086	256		nificant

Table 5-3b

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE MEAN EMPLOYEE
SCALE SCORES FOR THE SEVEN SCHOOLS

	Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F Ratio
Means	244,086	6	30,490.3	F = 5.6
Within	1,427,983	250	5,492	Signifi-
Total	1,672,069	256		cant at P > .01

Thus, certain schools seem to attract certain types of employee-oriented personnel, while professional orientations on the average, seem to be distributed more randomly among this same set of schools. Compared to the validation group scores (table 5-2), the schools in this sample all have relatively high professional orientations. Even the school with the lowest professional orientation ($\bar{X} = 56.5$) is above the high professional criterion group drawn from the sample ($\bar{X} = 53.1$), and the highest school in the study ($\bar{X} = 61.1$) is above even the "known" professional group ($\bar{X} = 60.1$). On the other hand, there is much more dispersion on the employee orientation of the schools. One school equals the mean of the high criterion group ($\bar{X} = 77.3$) and one school ($\bar{X} = 86.3$) approaches the low criterion group's mean ($\bar{X} = 88.0$). The fact that the schools are self selectively high in professional orientation should be considered in interpreting the results. Any relationship found between the professionalism of the schools and other variables in this sample applies to the upper end of the continuum.

Table 5-4 reports a matrix of linear correlations between subscale scores and their respective total scale scores. The administrative orientation subscale is the most correlated with the total employee scale score ($r = .82$); almost two thirds of the variance is accounted for. Loyalty to the organization, rules and procedures, and public orientation are also correlated with the total score to a relatively high degree (between $r = .69$ and $.74$). The correlation of the interchangeability index with the total score is $r = .63$. The two-item index on experience shows only a low correlation with the total score ($r = .31$); this is short index and also constitutes only a small proportion of the total scale score.

The intercorrelations of the subscales of the total employee scale range from $r = .07$ to $r = .54$. Most of the subscales show a

reasonable intercorrelation (i.e. $r = .39$ or higher), but in no case is the intercorrelation remarkably high, and in several cases it is notably low. This pattern of intercorrelation does not, however, jeopardize the significance of the total scale comprised of these subscales. On the contrary, the pattern of correlations demonstrates precisely what a scale of this kind is supposed to do. It is supposed to provide a measure of several different dimensions of a complex concept. For example, when an employer attempts to evaluate his employees, he presumably weighs several separate characteristics, such as loyalty, punctuality, workmanship, appearance, etc. These characteristics constitute separate dimensions which are logically related, but which are not necessarily empirically related. Similarly, the objective of this type of scale is not to achieve a "uni-dimensional" measure, but to provide a composite index of a complex concept, consisting of several logically related dimensions. In such a scale all that is really necessary is that the subscales are related to the total concept that is being measured; it is not necessary that they be highly correlated among themselves, or that they contribute equally to the total scale score.

For the professional scale, the correlations of the subscale scores with the total scale score range from $r = .54$ to $r = .73$; each subscale contributes approximately 25 per cent to 50 per cent of the respective variances. Unlike the employee scale, none of the correlations is either exceptionally high or low.

Role Organization

The linear correlation between the two total scale scores is also reported in Table 5-4. There is virtually no relationship between the total scores of the two scales ($r = +.07$). They are essentially independent measures: i.e., a high professional

A MATRIX OF LINEAR CORRELATIONS AMONG TOTAL AND SUBSCALE SCORES OF
THE PROFESSIONAL AND EMPLOYEE ORIENTATION SCALES*

Type of Scale or Subscale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Employee Orientation Total Scale Score	--	+ .82	+ .69	+ .31	+ .63	+ .72	+ .74	+ .07 ^b				
2. Administrative Orientation		--	+ .44	+ .14	+ .41	+ .49	+ .54	+ .07				
3. Loyalty to the Organization			--	+ .22	+ .36	+ .39	+ .42	-.07				
4. Experience				--	+ .12	+ .07	+ .15	-.08				
5. Interchangeability					--	+ .43	+ .27	-.13				
6. Rules and Procedures						--	+ .41	-.13				
7. Public Orientation							--	+ .02				
8. Professional Orientation Total Scale Score									+ .54	+ .73	+ .61	+ .55
9. Client Orientation									--	+ .21 ^c	+ .07	+ .11
10. Orientation to Colleagues--Profession										--	+ .15	+ .23
11. Monopoly of Knowledge											--	+ .25
12. Decision-Making Authority												--

* N = 286. Values of $r = .12$ are significant at $P > .05$; values over $r = .15$ are significant at $P > .01$.

^a Since a low employee scale score indicates a high orientation, the sign above has been changed to indicate the direction of the relationship between the variables rather than between raw scores.

^b The intercorrelations between subscales of the two major scales are also low (between $r = +.07$ and $r = +.15$.)

orientation does not imply a low employee orientation -- as common useage of these terms has often implied. If they are not correlated, then how do personnel organize their orientations? And how does the "style" of role organization affect their behavior?

The sample distributions on both the professional and the employee total scale scores have been divided at the midpoints. Respondents whose scores on both scales are above the median have been classified as "high-professional and high-employee."* Another group of respondents scored low on both scales; they are not especially committed to either orientation. A third group has high professional orientations and low employee orientations. Finally, another group has low professional and high employee orientations. The distribution of these four types of role orientations in each school is reported in Table 5-5. The Chi square difference in the distribution between schools is significant at $P > .06$. Apparently, the process by which personnel with different role organizations become distributed throughout school systems is not an entirely random one. Neither, probably, are the problems which they find there.

Analysis of Role Behavior Items

Wherever it was appropriate (and in some cases it was not) respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which each of the normative statements (included in the final professional and in the employee orientation scales) is descriptive of the actual pattern of behavior existing in their schools; specifically, in conjunction with the normative statements they were asked: "This (the above statement) is the case at my school"; again, the five responses, which ranged from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree," were weighted in the same way.

The distribution of responses was tabulated by school. Some of these items were to be used as measures of how the organization

*Since the two scales have been scored in the opposite directions, technically, high professional-high employee oriented respondents are at numerically opposite poles of the two distributions.

Table 5-5

THE DISTRIBUTION OF EACH TYPE OF PROFESSIONAL-
EMPLOYEE ROLE ORGANIZATION, BY SCHOOL

School		High Professional- High Employee	High Professional- Low Employee	Low Professional- High Employee	Low Professional- Low Employee	Total
Code Number	Staff Size					
1	33	8 (27.6%)*	6 (20.7%)	9 (31.0%)	6 (20.7%)	29
2	53	6 (17.6%)	8 (23.5%)	7 (20.6%)	13 (38.2%)	34
3	20	3 (33.3%)	5 (5.6%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)	9
4	47	7 (29.2%)	3 (12.5%)	4 (16.7%)	10 (41.7%)	24
5	63	15 (26.3%)	15 (26.3%)	13 (22.8%)	14 (24.6%)	57
6	119	23 (30.7%)	13 (17.3%)	23 (30.7%)	16 (21.3%)	75
7	89	5 (18.5%)	9 (33.3%)	1 (3.7%)	12 (44.4%)	27
TOTAL		67	59	58	71	255

*The percentages pertain to totals within schools.

$\chi^2 = 28.5$; significant at $P > .06$ (18 d.f.)

actually functions, so the degree of consensus among the respondents in each school was analyzed. Since it is recognized that respondents' definitions of the response categories ("strongly agree," "agree," etc.) can vary somewhat, the proportion of agreement among respondents in each school has been computed by combining the two adjacent categories with the largest proportion of responses (i.e., "strongly agree" and "agree," or "undecided" and "agree"). On that assumption, items which did not meet each of two criteria were rejected: first, those items on which an average of 70 per cent of the respondents in each school did not agree were excluded; second, any item on which the agreement in any one school fell below 66 per cent was excluded. In practice, for most schools on most items, the agreement reached 85 to 90 per cent in the combined adjacent categories. A total of 14 descriptive behavior items have been retained from the employee and professional behavior scales. Further use will be made of some of these items later in this chapter.

Status Deprivation

The descriptive items will be used in conjunction with the normative statements in the professional and employee scales to obtain a "discrepancy" score for each group of respondents between their orientations (what ought to be) and their perception of actual role behavior. The difference between normative and descriptive responses for each group of respondents will be termed their "status deprivation." It is a "deprivation" in the sense that a situation in which the actual practice diverges from the norms discourages the persons in it from fulfilling their conceptions of their status. Since most of the descriptive scores will be used solely to compare the normative scales, they are technically not "scales" in themselves, but components of the orientation scales already developed.

Critical Incident Scales: Initiative and Compliance

One part of the questionnaire consists of 26 hypothetical "incidents," or situations in which the teacher might find himself or herself opposed to the administration (see Appendix IIc). While the set of incidents described in this instrument are hypothetical, they are based on reports of similar incidents found in case studies of school systems, in legal cases involving teachers, and in some of the literature on role conflicts and problems in education which was reported in Chapters 2 and 3. A sample item from this scale appears below:

The assistant principal told a teacher that he was too "outspoken" in criticizing certain policies of the school and that this was causing unrest among the faculty members. Imagine yourself as the teacher.

Similar items describe an attempt of the principal to determine the course content and methods of teaching, the participation of a teacher in local school board elections against school board rules, the efforts of a principal to change a grade given by one of his teachers, efforts of the administration to prohibit the use of a standard textbook because it was "socialistically" inclined, disapproval of the administration's proposed change of a course of study, a teacher who takes a public stand on the issue of water fluoridation in a community that is divided on the issue, a teacher who refuses to move into the school district where he is teaching, and a problem involving discrimination against women in the school.

The respondent was asked to imagine himself as the teacher in this situation and to respond to structured alternatives to three questions. The first question is, "What would you do in this situation?"; the possible alternatives are "comply with superior's request," "try to compromise," "seek support of colleagues," "ask for an investigation by a professional organization," "refuse to comply

with the request," or "quit the job." The second question is, "What do you anticipate will happen to you if you do not comply with the above request?" The respondent was asked to check one of the following alternatives: "no disapproval or mild disapproval from the principal," "strong disapproval but no formal action from the principal," "loss of reputation," "loss of deserved promotion or deserved salary increase," "transferred to a less desirable position," and "dismissal from the school system." Both sets of responses were weighted from 1 to 6*

The format for these items is based on one used in other studies. Gross, Mason, and McEachern have developed a theory of role conflict which states that, when confronted with two conflicting role expectations, the incumbent of a position chooses one of four different actions: conformity to expectation "A," conformity to expectation "B," compromise, or avoidance (4). They hypothesize that three factors account for the incumbent's choice: legitimacy (whether or not he believes the group making the claim has the right to expect him to conform), sanctions (the penalties perceived as a consequence), and personal orientation (the relative weight which the respondent places on legitimacy and sanctions). Gross and his associates considered three types of personal orientation: the morally oriented person, who places more weight on legitimacy than on sanctions; the expediently oriented person, who places more weight on sanctions than on legitimacy; and the moral-expedient person, who weights both dimensions relatively equally. They found that the moral-expedient personality is the most frequent. Using these three factors, role resolutions were predicted and then compared with the actions taken by school superintendents.

*Respondents were also permitted to give an "other" alternative. Most of the responses given parallel the given categories, but may be considered more specific statements of them.

Disputing that personal orientation needs to be treated as a stable personality trait, Miller and Schull have based a study on the assumption that predictions of role conflict resolution can be made by ascertaining only two of the variables, legitimacy and sanctions (11). In other words, the personal orientation has been conceptualized as a variable rather than as a stable personality trait, thereby allowing for the possibility that the same individual might make different choices in role conflict situations according to the nature of the situation. They constructed hypothetical role conflict situations based on actual conflicts which a sample of business and labor leaders described for them. The questionnaire consisted of two sets of expectations supposedly expressed by different parties who were in authority over the respondent. Respondents were asked to assess the right of each party to expect conformity to his expectation, and to indicate in terms of this forced choice scale what would happen if he does not follow the wishes of either party: "no disapproval," "mild disapproval," "strong disapproval but no formal action taken," "loss of possible salary increases or promotion," "placed in lower status position," or "discharged." The respondents were also asked to indicate in a similar forced choice scale what they would do in the situation described. Two of the courses of action involved maximizing either one of two alternatives, two involved compromises, and one involved avoidance of the situation. An overall predictive accuracy of 71 per cent was reported for the type of action taken by training directors, labor leaders and two populations of business managers when confronted by the role conflicts.

In both of these studies, the investigators used one set of respondent choices to predict the other set. However, the items that

have been developed for the present study are intended for a different use. Responses to the question, "What would you do in this situation?" will provide an index of the amount of "initiative" and "compliance" which the respondent is willing to assume in a situation. The responses were weighted from one to six in the order listed; it is assumed that the lower the respondent's score on this question, the more compliance he displays to the administration. The responses to the question, "What do you anticipate would happen to you if you do not comply with the above request?" will be taken as an index to the respondent's perception of restraint in the authority system -- i.e., how strictly teachers are governed in the school. A high score indicates what is assumed to be strong negative sanctions or a high degree of restraint.

Each respondent's answers to the first question (part A) and to the second question (part B) on all twenty-six items of the original instrument were totaled. The internal consistency of each part has been analyzed separately, using the procedures used to construct the professional and employee status orientation scales. Two criteria were used to select the items to be included in the final scale: (1) a significant difference on the item between the groups whose total score was in the upper 30 per cent and in the lower 30 per cent, and (2) a scale value difference ratio (SVDR) on both Parts A and B above .50.* The twelve items that were retained as a result of this analysis are listed in Appendix IIc.

The reliability of each scale (Part A and Part B) was assessed by using the split-half correlation technique again. The scale items were randomly divided, and the responses of the 264 respondents

*In a few cases where the essence of an acceptable item had already been included in another acceptable item, one of the statistically acceptable items has been excluded.

correlated. The split-half correlation for Part A is $r = .74$, which, when corrected with the Spearman-Brown formula, is $r_n = .998$. The split-half correlation for Part B is $r = .78$, which when corrected is $r_n = .999$.

Thus, as a result of the above analyses, two scales have been constructed. The first scale (the average of responses to Part A of the twelve selected items), measures the respondent's overall "compliance" and "initiative" with respect to the administration. The second scale (the average responses to Part B of the twelve items), measures the respondent's perception of the severity of sanctions in his school, or in the existing "restraint."

The Significance of Critical Incident Scales

Several years ago Stouffer reported using hypothetical incidents to study role conflict (13). Respondents were asked to imagine themselves in situations where they were forced to choose between loyalty to their peers and their official obligations. For example, a student sees another student cheating; respondents were asked to imagine themselves in the situation and to select one of a set of alternatives, which range from moderate to extreme, concerning exposing the cheating student. They were also asked to predict the degree of approval that the college authorities are likely to give to each alternative course of action.

Stouffer was able to show that there is considerable variation in the degree of role conflict experienced by respondents who are supposedly imagining themselves in the same situation, depending on their definition of that situation. The respondents were classified into three types on the basis of their perceived role conflict:

1. Those who thought that their actions would be approved by both the officials and their peers; conformity to both groups was no problem for them.

2. Those who saw no overlap between what the officials and what their peers would have approved; for them simultaneous conformity to both groups was impossible; (they tended to conform to their peers).

3. Those who found at least one hypothetical situation which would be approved by both officials and peers; they experienced only a moderate degree of role conflict.

This use of hypothetical incident techniques has been criticized by Korber, who has charged that in such incidents the situations are stated so abstractly that the essential qualifying criteria upon which actual judgments are made in real life are omitted (6). He has suggested a more realistic procedure by which qualifications are consecutively added to the situation for independent consideration in such a way that different responses to the same basic situation would provide a continuum.

Taken in its extreme implications, Korber's objections should not be permitted to obscure the fundamental advantage of this method, which is that it allows a normally complex situation to be simplified by abstracting all irrelevant details from it. In this way, certain characteristics of the situation which are of interest to the investigator may be examined independently of theoretically irrelevant circumstances. Responses to such incidents are of interest because they display the respondent's value system, not because they predict his actual behavior under extenuating circumstances.

Nevertheless, Korber's suggestion to add qualifying conditions that approximate some of the major conditions of actual situations is well taken. It is especially true, for example, that the meaning of an act is gravely affected by the amount of restraint under which it occurs. For example, a person who refuses to conform

to what is approved by others when the sanctions are severe shows greater opposition to social pressure than one whose nonconformity is unopposed. In this respect, an approach along the lines which Korber has suggested seems to be in order. The following analysis will be concerned with the difference between the degree of initiative or compliance which an act represents in comparison with the severity of the sanctions (i.e., the amount of restraint) under which it occurs.

A Typology of Initiative and Compliance

A typology of the "initiative" and "compliance" of respondents has been established by comparing each respondent's total score to the twelve items on scale A with his responses to the parallel questions in scale B. The anticipated actions were divided into three types -- "initiative," "discretion," and "compliance." Those respondents who anticipated that their actions would be either to comply with the superior's request or to compromise (responses 1 or 2) may be said to have shown "compliance." Those whose anticipated action was to seek support of colleagues may be said to have used "discretion." Those who anticipated action was to ask for an investigation by a professional organization, to refuse to comply with the request, or to quit the job may be said to have anticipated using "initiative."

Each of the above types was again divided on the basis of responses to scale B. Those who predicted either "no disapproval or mild disapproval from the principal," or "loss of reputation", may be said to be under "moderate constraint." Those who predicted "loss of deserved promotion or deserved salary increase," "transfer to less desirable position," or "dismissal from the school system" are under "severe constraint."

In this way, six types of potential behavior patterns have been established in connection with hypothetical critical incidents. They are outlined in Figure 5-3. Respondents whose anticipated action is one of initiative in the face of severe constraint may be said to exhibit "rebellious" behavior patterns; those whose anticipated action is one of initiative in the face of only moderate constraint may be said to express "contrary" behavior patterns; discretion in the face of severe constraint may be termed "defiant," while the exercise of discretion in the face of moderate constraint is a "cautious" behavior pattern; if compliance is anticipated in the face of predicted severe constraint it may be called a "realistic" behavior pattern; while finally, anticipated compliance in the face of predicted moderate constraint may be labeled as a "submissive" pattern. The first four types in the figure "oppose" the administration, but they do it in different ways, and under different conditions of constraint. They are ranked not only in terms of how strongly they are opposed, but also in terms of the degree of risk that they are willing to take. The rebellious, defiant, and realistic all exist under rather severe constraint, but they show different degrees of initiative and compliance. On the other hand, neither the contrary nor cautious nor submissive is in a situation of very great risk, but they differ in terms of the degree of opposition they would express.

It should be emphasized that the typology is of anticipated behavior patterns rather than of personality types. That is, the type of behavior pattern anticipated is believed to be more dependent on the situation than on personality traits. For example, a person who shows a submissive behavior pattern in the above situations may become quite rebellious in situations that do not involve

professional authority or in other areas, such as politics, or under other conditions such as receiving an outside job offer.

Figure 5-3

A TYPOLOGY OF INITIATIVE AND COMPLIANCE

Type of Behavior Pattern	Anticipated Action ^a	Predicted Constraint ^b
I. Rebellious	Initiative	Severe
II. Contrary	Initiative	Moderate
III. Defiant	Discretion	Severe
IV. Cautious	Discretion	Moderate
V. Realistic	Compliance	Severe
VI. Submissive	Compliance	Moderate

a. The labels for anticipated action are based on responses to the question, "What would you do in the situation described above?"

Initiative -- ask for an investigation by a professional organization; or, refuse to comply with request; or, quit the job.

Discretion -- seek support of colleagues.

Compliance -- comply with superior's request; or, try to compromise.

b. The labels for predicted constraint are based on responses to the question, "What do you anticipate will happen to you if you do not comply with the above request?"

Severe constraint -- loss of deserved promotion or salary increase; or, transferred to less desirable position; or, dismissed from the school system.

Moderate constraint -- no disapproval or mild disapproval from the principal; or, loss of reputation.

The distribution of each of these types in the total sample is shown in Table 5-6 while Table 5-7 reports the distribution of the types by school. It will be noted that only a small proportion of the sample are rebellious (10%), and only 19 per cent are either rebellious or contrary. On the other hand, one in four teachers would comply; one in five teachers has a potential for a completely submissive behavior pattern in conflict episodes with the administration (i.e., would comply without the threat of sanctions). The majority of teachers (52%) would, however, use a discreet form of

Table 5-6

DISTRIBUTION OF TYPES OF ANTICIPATED
INITIATIVE AND COMPLIANCE EXPRESSED BY
TEACHERS TO CRITICAL INCIDENTS, FOR TOTAL SAMPLE
(N = 241)

Anticipated Action	Degree of Constraint		Totals
	Severe	Moderate	
Initiative	Type I Rebellious 24 (10%) ^a	Type II Contrary 22 (9%)	46
Discretion	Type III Defiant 49 (20%)	Type IV Cautious 79 (32%)	128
Compliance	Type V Realistic 15 (6%)	Type VI Submissive 52 (22%)	67
TOTALS	88	153	241

^aExpressed as per cent of the total sample

Table 5-7

**DISTRIBUTION OF TYPES OF ANTICIPATED INITIATIVE AND COMPLIANCE
EXPRESSED BY TEACHERS TO CRITICAL INCIDENTS, BY SCHOOL**

Type of Behavior Pattern ^a	School							Totals
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
I. Rebellious	5 (18.5%) ^b	2 (5.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	7 (13.7%)	7 (9.6%)	3 (13.0%)	24 (10.0%)
II. Contrary	2 (7.4%)	4 (11.8%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (9.1%)	5 (9.8%)	6 (8.2%)	3 (13.0%)	22 (9.1%)
III. Defiant	5 (18.5%)	12 (35.3%)	6 (54.5%)	2 (9.1%)	8 (15.7%)	9 (12.3%)	7 (30.4%)	49 (20.3%)
IV. Cautious	10 (37.0%)	9 (26.5%)	3 (27.3%)	12 (54.5%)	17 (33.3%)	22 (30.1%)	6 (26.1%)	79 (32.8%)
V. Realistic	1 (3.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (9.1%)	2 (9.1%)	4 (7.8%)	7 (0.6%)	0 (0.0%)	15 (6.2%)
VI. Submissive	4 (14.8%)	7 (20.6%)	1 (9.1%)	4 (18.2%)	10 (19.6%)	22 (30.1%)	4 (17.4%)	52 (21.6%)
TOTALS	27	34	11	22	51	73	23	241

^a See Figure 5-3 for a brief definition of the types

^b Expressed as per cent of respondents in the school

opposition, only more are cautious in this respect than are defiant. It is interesting to note that only six per cent of the respondents show a "realistic" tendency; i.e., compliance in the face of severe sanctions. This may mean that those teachers who comply by and large do so because they want to rather than because of external pressures.

There seems to be considerable variability in the way these types are distributed among the schools, although the sample is so small in many cells that the chance factor is undoubtedly operating too. Further demonstration of the distribution of these types among schools of different sizes will have to await a larger sample.

OTHER INDICES AND MEASURES OF RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Besides the scales, several other indices of respondent orientation and behavior have been developed.

Local-Cosmopolitan Orientation and Behavior

The conceptualization of local and cosmopolitan orientation and behavior was discussed in Chapter 2 (see Figure 2-1) where general indices and specific measures were suggested for each variable. The measures actually used and the methods employed to identify each category now will be described in more detail. Figure 5-4 outlines the measures and responses that have been utilized. Five indices of behavior were used to classify respondents as either cosmopolitan or locals (listed in the figure). The index consists of the proportion of these five responses on which the respondent scored as a local and as a cosmopolitan. The distribution of locals and cosmopolitans on these measures, by school, appears in Table 5-8. Twice as many teachers are locals than cosmopolitans on four or five indices.

Local and cosmopolitan orientations have been identified from responses to a hypothetical situation (this question is also listed in Figure 5-4). Respondents whose first two choices were both in the same category (i.e., both local or both cosmopolitan) have been differentiated from those whose first and second ratings were split between the local and cosmopolitan classification. The distribution of respondents who are locals and who are cosmopolitans on these responses is reported by school in Table 5-8a. Three times as many teachers are locally oriented as cosmopolitan on both responses.

The rank order correlation among schools on the local behavioral indices and reference group orientation is $r_s = +.76$ (significant at $P .05$); that is, schools which exemplify local behavior also tend to be locally oriented. But the same is not true of cosmopolitans. The rank order correlation between behavior and orientation is not significant ($r_s = +.32$). While this correlation is in the expected direction, it means that cosmopolitan-oriented schools do not necessarily act that way; and conversely, schools that would appear to manifest cosmopolitanism do not necessarily uphold a cosmopolitan value system. From this evidence, it may be conjectured that immobility and the presence of community involvement are sufficient to produce a local orientation, but mobility and community detachments are not sufficient for cosmopolitan orientation. If so, localism and cosmopolitanism had best be treated as independent variables.

Criticism Checklist

Sixty items were included in the initial questionnaire expressing complaints that teachers sometimes have expressed about their colleagues, the administration, the school, and the public. Respondents were asked to indicate how often the situations have occurred in their school system -- "very often," "often," and "seldom" and

Figure 5-4

LOCAL-COSMOPOLITAN BEHAVIORAL AND ORIENTATION INDICES

Local-Cosmopolitan Behavioral Indices		
General Class	Specific Measure	Response
Affiliation with Local Institution and the Community	Total Number of Years in System:	
	Local	9 years or more
	Cosmopolitan	Less than 9 years
	Previous Residence in the County Where Now Teaching:	
	Local	Yes
	Cosmopolitan	No
	Held Office in a Community Organization:	
	Local	Yes
	Cosmopolitan	No
Experience with Other Systems and Regions	Total Number of Systems in Which Taught:	
	Local	Same state or same county
	Cosmopolitan	Crossed 1 or more state lines

Local-Cosmopolitan Orientation Indices

General Class	Specific Measure	Response
Reference Group in the System or Community vs. Reference Group Outside the System or Community	Assume that there is a disagreement in the school district about whether to build a new school especially to accommodate the mentally gifted children in the system. Please rate in importance the first and second individuals or groups whom you feel would be most important to you for guidance in making up your own mind:	
	Local	Teachers in the school, Superintendent, School Board, Parents' Groups, Principal.
	Cosmopolitan	Professional Teachers' Associations, Colleagues, U.S. Office of Education, participants in professional conferences.

DISTRIBUTION OF LOCALS AND COSMOPOLITANS
ACCORDING TO BEHAVIOR, BY SCHOOL

School		Behavior												
Code	Sample Size	Number of Indices Classified as Locals ^b					Number of Indices Classified as Cosmopolitans							
Number		0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5	
1	33	0 (0.0%) ^a	2 (5.9%)	9 (26.5%)	15 (44.1%)	6 (17.6%)	2 (5.9%)	3 (8.8%)	7 (20.6%)	16 (47.1%)	6 (17.6%)	2 (5.9%)	0 (0.0%)	
2	53	2 (4.3%)	7 (14.9%)	11 (23.4%)	18 (38.3%)	8 (17.0%)	1 (2.1%)	1 (2.1%)	14 (29.8%)	16 (34.0%)	9 (19.1%)	5 (10.6%)	2 (4.3%)	
3	11	0 (0.0%)	3 (27.3%)	5 (45.5%)	2 (18.2%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (9.1%)	1 (9.1%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (36.4%)	3 (27.3%)	3 (27.3%)	0 (0.0%)	
4	26	1 (3.8%)	4 (15.4%)	9 (34.6%)	8 (30.8%)	4 (15.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (19.2%)	8 (30.8%)	8 (30.8%)	5 (19.2%)	0 (0.0%)	
5	62	1 (1.6%)	3 (4.8%)	23 (37.1%)	16 (25.8%)	16 (25.8%)	3 (4.8%)	4 (6.5%)	18 (29.0%)	19 (30.6%)	18 (29.0%)	2 (3.2%)	1 (1.6%)	
6	87	0 (0.0%)	15 (17.2%)	25 (28.7%)	25 (28.7%)	17 (19.5%)	5 (5.7%)	6 (6.9%)	23 (26.4%)	26 (29.9%)	24 (27.6%)	8 (9.2%)	0 (0.0%)	
7	27	1 (3.7%)	13 (48.1%)	6 (22.3%)	5 (18.5%)	1 (3.7%)	1 (3.7%)	1 (3.7%)	2 (7.4%)	7 (25.9%)	7 (25.9%)	9 (33.3%)	1 (3.7%)	
TOTAL SAMPLE	294	5 (1.7%)	47 (15.9%)	88 (29.9%)	89 (30.3%)	52 (17.7%)	13 (4.4%)	16 (5.4%)	69 (23.5%)	96 (32.7%)	75 (25.5%)	34 (11.6%)	4 (.14%)	

^a Numbers in parentheses refer to percentages within the schools

^b Indices include: total number of years in system; previous residence in the county where now teaching; held office in a community organization; total number of systems in which taught; and number of state lines crossed to attend college.

Table 5-8a

DISTRIBUTION OF LOCALS AND COSMOPOLITANS
ACCORDING TO REFERENCE GROUP, BY SCHOOL

School		Respondents' Reference Groups ^a				
		Local		Cosmopolitan		No Data
Code Number	Sample Size	First and Second Choice	First Choice Only	First and Second Choice	First Choice Only	
1	34	9 (26.5%)	7 (20.6%)	5 (14.7%)	6 (17.6%)	7 (20.6%)
2	47	16 (34.0%)	10 (21.3%)	5 (10.6%)	9 (19.1%)	7 (14.9%)
3	11	4 (36.4%)	3 (27.3%)	1 (9.1%)	1 (9.1%)	2 (18.2%)
4	26	6 (23.1%)	6 (23.1%)	2 (7.7%)	9 (34.6%)	3 (11.5%)
5	62	28 (45.2%)	12 (19.4%)	4 (6.5%)	12 (19.4%)	6 (21.4%)
6	87	34 (39.1%)	14 (16.1%)	12 (13.8%)	19 (21.8%)	8 (9.2%)
7	27	6 (22.3%)	6 (22.3%)	5 (18.5%)	8 (29.6%)	2 (7.4%)
TOTAL SAMPLE	294	103 (35.0%)	58 (19.7%)	34 (11.6%)	64 (21.8%)	35 (11.9%)

^a Based on the first and second choices in response to the question, "Assume that there is a disagreement in the school district about whether to build a new school especially to accommodate the mentally gifted children in the system. Please rate in importance the first and second individuals or groups whom you feel would be most important to you for guidance in making up your own mind."

"never." The responses were weighted on a 4-point scale from one to four in the order listed. The items were ranked from 1 to 60,* on the basis of the proportion of respondents in the school sample indicating "very often" for each item. The thirty-five most frequently mentioned complaints have been retained on the final instrument; this includes the thirty highest ranking items on the "very often" category, plus five additional items that appeared in the first thirty-five when ranked by the "very often" and "often" categories combined. These items were then inspected for variability between the schools in the responses to each item. The twenty-two items which showed the highest inter-school difference between the school where it was mentioned most frequently and the one where it was mentioned least frequently were retained in the final instrument (see Appendix IIId). The fact that some items failed to discriminate between schools is probably indicative of region-wide problems, if not national ideologies about problems in teaching.

The remaining twenty-two criticisms have been classified on the basis of content into seven categories: (1) seven items critical of misuses of administrative authority, (2) two items critical of the way the school board uses its authority, (3) three items critical of the "school," i.e., complaints not directed against specific groups or positions, but about the way the school operates in general, (4) two items critical of the lack of authority that teachers have to make decisions, (5) one item critical of the hierarchy of administrative channels, (6) three items critical of the actions of other teachers, and (7) four items critical of public pressures. The five most frequently mentioned types of complaints are listed in Figure 5-5.

*They were ranked separately both on the basis of the "very often" response only, and on the basis of the "very often" and "often" categories combined; there was a close correspondence between the two rankings.

Figure 5-5

**THE FIVE MOST FREQUENTLY MENTIONED CRITICISMS
THAT TEACHERS HAVE OF THEIR SCHOOLS**

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Rank^a</u>	
39	1	Competitive athletics and/or other extra-curricular activities are emphasized over academic subjects.
37	2	There is little communication between parents and teachers within parent-teacher organizations.
42	3	Extra-curricular activities absorb too much of the students' and teachers' time.
43	4	Loyalty of the teachers to the administration rather than their professional merits is used as a criteria for promotion.
4	5	The school board does not attempt to understand the teachers.

^a Ranked by proportion of respondents reporting it "very often."
See Appendix IIId for the remaining items.

Job Satisfaction and Vocational Commitment

The job satisfactions of teaching personnel have been the subject of several investigations. The job satisfaction of teachers has been linked to their age (5), their sex and marital status (12), to urbanism (5), the freedom of teachers to plan their own work, the quality of administrative leadership and supervision, opportunity to participate in educational planning, salary, and adequate facilities (2). Schultz reports that the most significant differences between the most satisfied and the least satisfied teachers in his study were in the area of administrative practices and staff relations; the least satisfied teachers felt that they receive insufficient consideration from the administration (12).

Satisfaction has also been found to be associated with the size of organizations (8,14,15). However, the thesis that size adversely affects satisfaction was not supported in a recent study of 700

psychologists working in research organizations (10). Guba and Getzels report that the job satisfaction of teachers is a function of the convergence between the teacher's ideal expectations, and the demands of his colleagues and supervisors within the organization and the demands on him by outsiders (3). Bidwell also finds that a convergence of the role expectations of teachers and their administrators is accompanied by an expression of satisfaction with the teaching situation, while divergence produces dissatisfaction (1). In the schools where teachers were most dissatisfied, the major complaints concerned getting along with principals and other teachers, and differences in liking for classroom teaching.

Commitment to the career is far from being coincident with satisfaction with it, but commitment to the career is a relevant consideration. Eighty-eight per cent of a nationwide sample of beginning teachers surveyed by Mason said that they would enter teaching if they had to do it over again, 48 per cent said "definitely" and 40 per cent, "probably" (9). For secondary teachers, 80 per cent of the men and 86 per cent of the women said they either definitely or probably would enter teaching again. Two-thirds of the men and almost as many of the women said that they definitely or probably could achieve their long-run life goals by continuing in the classroom teaching as a career. Two-thirds of Mason's sample of beginning teachers also planned to teach in the same school district the following year and 18 per cent planned to teach in another district. Eighteen per cent said they would definitely leave teaching within five years, and one-third thought that they probably would. Only 29 per cent of the men and 16 per cent of the women thought they would teach until retirement.

Like Mason's beginning teachers, two-thirds of the present sample anticipate that they will be teaching in the same system in two years,

most of them on the same job (Table 5-9). The proportion varies from eighteen per cent of the twenty teachers in the smallest school to 77 per cent of the teachers in the 63-teacher school. Nine per cent of the present sample plan to be working in a different system in two years, about half of them on better jobs. Five per cent plan to return to the university temporarily while another 5 per cent plan to leave education altogether.

The career plans of teachers reflect their commitments to teaching, but such a measure does not indicate their personal involvements, or satisfaction with these commitments. To measure the satisfaction of beginning teachers more directly, Mason asked teachers to express the extent of their satisfaction with various aspects on their job, including their relations with their fellow teachers, with their students' parents, their salary, teaching load, etc. Among secondary teachers, women expressed a higher level of satisfaction than did men. The coefficient of correlation between beginning teachers' satisfaction and their salary was $r = .25$. There was a general relationship for both sexes combined between satisfaction with the job and size of community and type of district; teachers working in large districts located in small communities expressed the most satisfaction, while those in small districts in small communities were least satisfied.

In many of the above studies, the job satisfaction of teachers was assessed in terms of variations of the question, "How satisfied are you with your present job?" For a study of Massachusetts school superintendents, however, Gross and his colleagues developed job satisfaction scales (4). Eighty-three of the 105 superintendents in the sample said that they liked the superintendency very much and only 26 found "quite a few features" about the job that they dislike;

Table 5-9

WHAT TEACHERS ANTICIPATE THEY WILL BE DOING IN TWO YEARS^a

In Two Years Will Be:	Schools, by Code Number							Per Cent of Total Samp.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
In the same system, Total	19 (61%) ^b	27 (59%)	2 (18%)	19 (73%)	48 (77%)	57 (63%)	18 (66%)	190
Same job	15	21	2	15	38	44	17	152
Better job	3	5	6	4	6	11	1	30
Administration	1	1	0	0	4	2	0	8
In a different system, Total	1	4	2	1	4	8	7	27
Similar job	1	0	0	0	3	2	5	11
Better job	0	4	2	1	1	3	2	13
Administration	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
Return to University and will return to teaching	3	2	0	1	3	5	2	16
Part Time Teaching	4	2	1	1	0	3	0	11
Not in Education	2	4	3	0	3	3	0	15
Leaving Labor Force	1	3	0	0	2	2	0	7
Another type of work	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	4
Going to university--- will not return to teaching	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	4
Other	1	6	1	4	4	12	0	28
No Data	1	1	2	0	0	2	0	6
TOTAL SAMPLE	31	46	11	26	62	90	27	293
								100%
								2%

^a Based on response to the question, "What do you actually anticipate you will be doing two years from this June?"^b Per cent of school sample

the major dislike concerned inadequate leisure time. Seventy-two of them said that the school superintendency is at least one of the most satisfying careers they could follow, and most of the others conceded that it is as satisfying as most careers.

For the present research, several of the items have been included from the scale developed by Gross and his colleagues. The items are:

1. How does teaching compare with other types of work?
 the most satisfying career one could follow;
 one of the most satisfying careers; as satisfying
as most careers; less satisfying than most careers.
2. If you "had to do it over again" would you enter the field
of teaching?
 definitely yes; probably yes; probably no;
 definitely no.
3. On the whole, are you satisfied that the school adminis-
tration accepts you as a professional expert to the degree
to which you feel you are entitled by reason of your
position, training, and experience?
 very well satisfied; fairly well satisfied;
 fairly dissatisfied; very dissatisfied.
4. How satisfied are you with your present job when you
consider the expectations you had when you took the job?
 very well satisfied; fairly well satisfied;
 fairly dissatisfied; very dissatisfied.
5. Please check the statement which best expresses your feeling
concerning how satisfied you are with your job when you
compare it to other teaching jobs.
 very well satisfied; fairly well satisfied;
 fairly dissatisfied; very dissatisfied.

There is a reasonable degree of correlation between the first two items and among the last three items (Table 5-10). However, the correlations between the two sets of items are low. That is, within each set of items, correlations are probably high enough to warrant grouping together to obtain total scale scores for each set, but the correlations between each set do not appear to be of sufficient magnitude to justify grouping all five items. These two sets of items

also happen to be logically different. The first two pertain to satisfaction with the vocation of teaching, while the other three items pertain to satisfaction with the present job. So, it was decided to use two measures of job satisfaction: (a) satisfaction with the vocation of teaching (items 1 and 2) and (b) satisfaction with the present job (items 3-5).

Table 5-10

MATRIX OF LINEAR CORRELATIONS BETWEEN FIVE
JOB SATISFACTION AND VOCATIONAL SATISFACTION ITEMS (N = 276)

Item No.	Satisfaction With the Vocation		Satisfaction With the Job		
	1	2	3	4	5
1	-	<u>.56</u>	.23	.30	.22
2	-	-	.28	.37	.32
3	-	-	-	<u>.63</u>	<u>.39</u>
4	-	-	-	-	<u>.58</u>

INDICES OF STRUCTURAL CHARACTERISTICS

Developing Indices of Centralization

Centralization of authority, like several of the other concepts employed in this study, is a complex concept which is difficult to assess using simple indices. At best, the indices that can be employed within the scope of this study will be relatively crude. However, since the crux of centralization is the level of authority at which decisions are made, an instrument has been developed to assess where in the authority structure certain decisions which effect the teacher's classroom work are usually made, insofar as teachers know. In Part VI of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to

indicate (a) who "should have the final authority to approve" each of a series of thirty-two types of decisions, and (b) who "actually does" approve each type of decision. The possible alternatives include: the individual teachers involved, teachers' professions, the teaching faculty, a committee of teachers appointed by the principal, the principal in consultation with teachers, the principal, the superintendent, State Department of Education, school board members, committee of parents, and "undecided" (see Appendix II f).

The distributions of responses to both the normative and descriptive sections of the instrument have been analyzed with the objectives of selecting a set of items which are relevant to a professional view of decision making, and of establishing a reasonable scoring procedure. It is assumed that the further the decision is made from the teacher up the chain of command, the less control that teachers can have over the decision. However, at the same time, it is recognized that some types of decisions are considered by teachers to be unimportant for their own professional authority, outside of their sphere of special competence or direct concern.* It is difficult to fix criteria for determining whether a certain type of decision is important for professional authority except by the standards which professional persons themselves set. Therefore, the normative responses of the professional validating groups (i.e., the respondents used to validate the scales), were scrutinized for each type of decision in the present instrument. It was apparent that even the most professional teachers in the sample believe that many of the

*For example, in hospitals, whether the visiting hours for hospital patients are between 7 p.m. and 8 p.m., or from 7:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m., is of little professional concern to most physicians. However, whether or not a particular patient should have visitors may be of very direct concern. Similarly, in the public schools, the problem of scheduling classes is one which seems to be clearly outside of the realm of professional relevance for the teacher, although a work load that the class assignment involves may well be of professional concern.

decisions included in the original list are irrelevant to their professional authority -- that teachers should not have authority over them. Therefore, the decisions in the instrument have been categorized as "professionally relevant" and "professionally irrelevant" types of decisions, depending upon whether or not the most professional teachers in the sample, on the average, believe that the decision should be within the prerogative of teachers. On the professionally relevant items, the proportion of the "high professional" group responding to each alternative is roughly inversely proportional to the level of the hierarchy which the alternative denotes. Wherein the professionally relevant items primarily include types of decisions which directly affect classroom work, such as assignment of material, supplementary reading matter, etc., the professionally non-relevant decisions include authority within the broader sphere of the school or the school system, such as hiring and promoting teachers and adding or dropping of courses.

The above analysis pertains to the normative section of the instrument. The distribution of the responses of the total sample to the remaining items was then scrutinized for the ability of each item to discriminate between schools on the descriptive section. On several of these items, there appeared to be very little agreement among the respondents within a school concerning who does actually make certain types of decisions; several items were eliminated from this inspection. While this step eliminated most of the decisions on where there is extremely low consensus within schools, some intra-school disagreement among the respondents remains. But, of course, a certain amount of disagreement about who makes each type of decision is to be expected, since not all decisions of the same general type (such as selecting supplementary reading matter) are handled consistently in the same way every time and

between departments. It will be assumed that the proportion of teachers in each school who indicate each level of authority as making a certain type of decision is roughly indicative of the frequency with which decisions are actually made by each level.

The possible sources of authority over the decisions have been weighted from 1 (for the individual teachers involved) to 6 (for school board members and the State Department of Education). Parents were mentioned so seldom for each item that this response has been excluded from the analysis. Within each school the product of the weight of each response and the number of respondents who identified each level of authority was computed. The mean position of each school was computed for each part of the instrument (Table 5-11). The ranks of the schools on each of the two parts are similar ($r_s = .68$), but the difference (though it approaches significance) is not statistically significant at $P > .05$.

It should be noted that the mean differences between the schools are not very large. However, this ranking of the schools has been confirmed by an independent procedure.

The rank order of the schools on each part of the instrument has been compared with responses to the descriptive part of the "decision making authority" subscale of the professional orientation scale (Appendix IIe). The mean of this subscale summarizes teachers' perceptions of their decision-making power in terms of several generalized statements. The rank order correlation of the seven schools between the "decision-making authority" subscale and the non-professionally relevant items of the decision-making instrument is $r_s = +.92$ (Table 5-12). In other words, the global procedure provides conclusions about the centralization of authority which are comparable to those based on the non-professional items in the decision-making instrument. However, the correlation ($r_s = +.62$) between the

Table 5-11

**RANK ORDER OF THE SCHOOLS ON INDICES OF CENTRALIZED DECISION-MAKING,
STANDARDIZATION AND AUTONOMY OF PERSONNEL**

School	Centralization (Decision-Making) Indices				Standardization Indices				Autonomy of Personnel				
	Professionally Relevant Decisions on the Decision-Making Instrument	Relevant Decisions on the Decision-Making Instrument	Decision-Making Descriptive Subscale of the Professional Orientation Scale	Rules and Procedures of the Employee Orientation Scale	Rules and Procedures and Interchangeability Subscales of the Employee Orientation Scale	Rate at Which Teachers Consult The Administration	Rank Order H-L						
Code Number	Mean ^a	Rank Order H-L	Mean ^a	Rank Order H-L	Mean ^b	Rank Order H-L	Mean ^b	Rank Order H-L	Times/Person	Rank Order H-L			
Staff Size													
1	33	2.77	1	4.80	2	2.43	2.5	10.2	1	3.85	1	4.13	3
2	53	2.24	4	4.26	6	2.17	7	12.2	6	4.42	7	2.67	6
3	20	2.22	5	4.76	3	2.43	2.5	10.9	2	4.38	6	3.00	5
4	47	1.87	7	4.15	7	2.23	6	12.3	7	4.20	4	5.68	1
5	63	2.32	3	4.32	5	2.40	4	11.1	3.5	3.87	2	5.50	2
6	119	2.76	2	4.82	1	2.50	1	11.1	3.5	3.98	3	2.38	7
7	89	2.13	6	4.35	4	2.30	5	11.2	5	4.24	5	3.87	4

^a 1 = Individual Teachers and Teachers' Professions; 2 = The Teaching Faculty; 3 = The Principal in Consultation with Teachers or Teachers' Committees; 4 = Principal; 5 = Superintendent; 6 = School Board and State Department of Education (Parents were omitted).

^b A lower score indicates stronger agreement with statements that signify high standardization.

professionally relevant types of decisions and the "decision-making" subscale is too low to be statistically significant at $P > .05$, although it is in the positive direction and approaches significance. The fact that the correlation is in the positive direction but is not as high as the correlation with the professionally non-relevant items probably can be explained on the grounds that the items included in the decision making subscale are not explicitly limited to decision making authority over the classroom, while the professional decisions tend to be of this type. It is concluded that there is enough similarity between the way the schools are ranked using the two procedures that, even though the mean differences between the schools are not very large, the decision-making instrument appears to be reliable.

Standardization of Work

Table 5-12 also reports two ways in which standardization has been measured, utilizing two descriptive subscales of the employee orientation scale. One of the subscales pertains to the specificity and enforcement of "rules and procedures" in the school and classroom (Appendix IIe). The other subscale, abbreviated as "interchangeability," indicates the emphasis placed on standardized lesson plans and procedures, and the interchangeability of personnel throughout the school and school system. The "rules and procedures" index was considered separately and in conjunction with the "interchangeability" index. The rank order correlation between the schools on the two types of measures provides a positive correlation of only $r_s = +.49$, which is too low to be statistically significant. However, it is interesting to note that the rank order of schools on the rules and procedures subscale is positively and significantly correlated with all three measures of centralization noted above. This implies either that the indices of centralization

**SPEARMAN RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS BETWEEN INDICES OF
CENTRALIZED DECISION MAKING, STANDARDIZATION, AND AUTONOMY OF PERSONNEL^a**

	DECISION MAKING					STANDARDIZATION		AUTONOMY
	Mean of professionally relevant items on the decision-making instrument	Mean of professionally non-relevant items on the decision-making instrument	Mean of decision-making professional descriptive (mean of the subscale)	Proportion reporting that teachers make professionally relevant decisions	Mean of Rules and Procedures subscale of the descriptive employee scale	Mean of rules and procedures and interchangeability subscales of 2 descriptive employee scales	Rate at which teachers consult with the administration	
I. Mean of professionally relevant items on the decision-making instrument	---							
II. Mean of professionally non-relevant items on the decision-making instrument	+.68	---						
III. Mean of decision-making descriptive subscale of the professional orientation scale	+.62	+.92**	---					
IV. Proportion of faculty reporting that teachers make professionally relevant decisions	+.82*	-.54	-.40	---				
V. Mean of rules and procedures descriptive subscale of the employee orientation scale	+.71*	+.79*	+.80*	-.35	---			
VI. Combined mean of rules and procedures and interchangeability descriptive subscales of the employee orientation scale	+.607	+.39	+.53	-.14	+.49	---		
VII. Rate at which teachers consult the administration	-.32	-.54	-.33	+.71*	-.17	+.43		

^a Using the Spearman Rank Order Correlation method; see Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics (McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956), "Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient", pp. 202-213.

* Significant at $P > .05$

** Significant at $P > .01$

and standardization are measuring the same type of thing, or that centralization is highly correlated with standardization; the latter seems to be a reasonable inference in view of the fact that centralized decisions are usually implemented in terms of rules and emphasis on procedures.

An Index of Heterogeneity

A variety of "latent" roles and value systems exist in most organizations by virtue of the social backgrounds and different experiences and training of the personnel. Some of the major characteristics which contribute to this heterogeneity have been incorporated into a simple profile index. Background characteristics have been dichotomized and simple ratios computed for each school:

Males to Females

Persons under 30 in the school to those over 45

Single to married

"Rural" to "urban" background (those who graduated from a high school in a city of under 10,000 to those graduated in a city of over 10,000.

The number of jobs in which the individual has worked, as compared to his years of teaching experience.

The number of persons hired in the school in the past two years, compared to the faculty size during the past two years.

The number of persons with M.A. degrees or more, to those with B.A.'s or less.

The ratio of the number of part-time to full-time teachers.

Members of unions to members of professional associations.

In addition, five characteristics by which local and cosmopolitan behavioral characteristics were identified have been considered as a separate part of the total index of heterogeneity. Local-cosmopolitan ratios have been computed for each school between:

The number of persons in the school over nine years and those less than nine years.

Persons having previous residence in the county where they are teaching and those who have not.

Those who had held office in a community organization and those who had not.

The number of persons who had worked in only one system and those who had worked in more than one system.

Those who had attended college in the same state where they are teaching and those who had not.

A total heterogeneity index score was obtained for each school by treating each of the ratios as of equivalent importance and obtaining their arithmetic sum. Subtotals for the local-cosmopolitan group of characteristics were computed in the same way. Table 5-13 reports the total heterogeneity ratio, by school, for each index. The average index score for the entire sample is 7.8, but the schools vary from 5.1 to 11.6. For most schools the main contributing factors to the heterogeneity score are sex ratio, urban background ratio, and ratio of years worked in the system. The main factor contributing to the high heterogeneity index in school 7 is the ratio of the persons who attended college in another state from where they are teaching.

It is commonly assumed that the amount of heterogeneity in these latent background characteristics increases with the size of organizations. An inspection of Table 5-13 suggests that there is a certain amount of truth in this, in the sense that the lowest heterogeneity ratio is found in the smallest school in the sample (school 3, 20 teachers), and the second largest school (school 7, 89 teachers) has the highest ratio. However, it is also true that the largest school in the sample (school 6, 119 teachers) does not have the highest ratio, and one of the higher ratios is reported for school 1, which is a medium size school (33 teachers). The Spearman rank order correlation between staff size of the seven schools and the total heterogeneity of the schools is $r_s = +.57$ (Table 5-14). While this magnitude of correlation is in the expected direction, it is not statistically significant. If it does prove to be significant in a larger sample, it means that size could account for as much as one-third in heterogeneity. The fact that the largest school in the study, which ranks fifth, is the prime factor which

HETEROGENEITY RATIOS, BY SCHOOL

Index of Heterogeneity	School 1	School 2	School 3	School 4	School 5	School 6	School 7	Total Sample
1. Sex Ratio: (Male/Female)	2.1	.9	1.2	1.6	1.9	1.8	1.3	1.6
2. Age Ratio: (Under 30/Over 45)	.3	.2	1.7	.3	.3	.5	1.4	.4
3. Marital Status Ratio: (Single/Married)	.3	.4	.0	.3	.4	.2	.6	.3
4. Urban Background: (Graduated in a city of under 10,000/Graduated in a city over 10,000)	1.1	1.6	.2	1.1	1.3	1.7	2.0	1.4
5. Mobility Ratio: (No. of jobs/ Years of Experience)	.2	.1	.3	.1	.1	.1	.2	.2
6. Staff Expansion and Turnover Ratio: (No. hired in past two years/Faculty size in past two years)	.03	.3	.3	.06	.08	.15	.12	.15
7. Education Ratio: (M.A. or better/B. A. or less)	.8	1.1	.1	.7	.6	.4	.9	.5
8. Ratio of Activity in Teacher Organizations: (Union/OEA)	.0	.5	.0	.0	.04	.01	.5	.1
<u>Local and Cosmopolitan Indices</u>								
9. Ratio of No. of years in the System: (Over 9 years/Under 9 years)	1.8	1.3	.2	1.0	1.2	1.0	.6	1.1
10. Ratio of Previous Residence in County Where Now Teaching: (Yes/No)	.7	1.6	.4	.5	1.6	1.2	.3	.99
11. Ratio of Office Holders in Community Organizations: (Yes/No)	1.1	.2	.4	.8	.6	.4	.2	.5
12. Ratio of No. of Systems Taught In: (1 or less/2 or more)	.3	.5	.4	.1	.8	.7	1.1	.6
13. Ratio of Those Attended College in the Same State Where Teaching: (Yes/No)	.2	.4	.2	.1	.2	.3	3.5	.4
Subtotal, Local-Cosmopolitan Index:	4.1	4.0	1.6	2.5	4.4	3.6	5.7	3.59
Total Heterogeneity Index:	8.93	9.1	5.4	6.66	9.12	8.46	12.72	8.24
Rank Order of Schools on Total Het. Index:	4	3	7	6	2	5	1	
Rank Order of Schools on Local-Cos. Index:	3	4	7	6	2	5	1	

pulls the correlation down suggests that the association is curvilinear; after a point further increases in sheer size do not increase heterogeneity further.

Table 5-14

RANK ORDER CORRELATION BETWEEN STAFF SIZE
AND TOTAL HETEROGENEITY OF SCHOOLS ^a

Code No.	School Staff Size	Staff Size Rank	Total Heterogeneity Rank
1	33	6	4
2	53	4	3
3	20	7	7
4	47	5	6
5	63	3	2
6	119	1	5
7	89	2	1

^a Using the Spearman Rank Order Correlation method; see Sidney Siegel Nonparametric Statistics (McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1956), "Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient," pp. 202-213

$R_s = .57$; not significant at $P > .05$.

The Informal Structure

Departmental Autonomy

In the questionnaire teachers were asked to describe briefly the types of problems about which they have consulted with the administration since the beginning of the school year and to indicate the number of times administrators in the system were consulted since September about each problem. While there is a great deal of variation within departments, the rate of consultation per person teaching related courses will provide a crude index of the extent

to which each department in a school is dependent on the administration to make its decisions. As a preliminary inspection, the distribution has been obtained for each type of department in the sample. While the autonomy of departments ranks differently in different schools, Table 5-15 reports only the average rank for the seven schools. Generally, the language, math and athletic departments have more autonomy from the administration than the other departments. The non-academic departments, home economics, and English have the least autonomy. At this point, it can only be speculated how this might affect conflict patterns.

The Prestige System

There is a prestige hierarchy among the courses which teachers teach. This hierarchy is undoubtedly an important, if not the determining element of the prestige system among public school teachers. The prestige of courses has been estimated on the basis of the functional importance which teachers themselves attribute to particular courses. Teachers were asked to assume that budget limitations have made it necessary to eliminate three courses from the present curriculum, and to indicate three courses which should be the first to be eliminated and three which should be the last to be eliminated. The rank of each course was determined on the basis of the difference between the proportion of the faculty mentioning it as the last and the proportion mentioning it as the first to be eliminated. Table 5-15 also summarizes the average rank order of the courses for the seven schools, grouped by department. Generally speaking, the academic subjects bestow more prestige, especially English, math and science. At the other extreme the applied, vocational and non-academic (extra curricular) course areas rank low.

However, it is interesting to note the correlation of this prestige ranking with autonomy. The Spearman rank order correlation

Table 5-15

AUTONOMY AND PRESTIGE RANKINGS OF TYPES OF DEPARTMENTS IN THE SAMPLE

Department ^a	Autonomy		Prestige	
	Number of times administration is consulted per person	Rank Order (H - L) Autonomy	Difference between proportion men- tioning courses as last and first to be eliminated	Rank Order (H - L) Prestige
Business	2.7	5	- 4.3%	7
Mathematics	1.8	3	+17.5%	2
Science	4.1	8	+ 9.1%	3
Vocational	3.5	7	- 9.9%	9
English	4.6	9	+30.8%	1
Language	.4	1	- 2.1%	5
Social Science	3.4	6	+ 3.4%	4
Athletics	2.5	4	- 3.8%	6
Home Economics	6.9	10	- 6.0%	8
Non-academic Courses	8.5	11	-15.6%	11
Miscellaneous	1.0	2	-10.9%	10

Legend: BUSINESS--Accounting, Bookkeeping, Business Administration, Business Education, Office Practice, Typing, Shorthand, Commercial

MATHEMATICS--Algebra, Geometry, Math, Trigonometry

SCIENCE--Biology, Biological Science, Chemistry, Health, Natural Science, Physics, Geology

VOCATIONAL--Blueprint Reading, Drafting, Drawing, Electronics, Industrial Arts, Vocational Education, Agriculture, Printing

ENGLISH--English, Literature, Reading Improvement, Journalism

LANGUAGE--French, Latin, Spanish, etc.

SOCIAL SCIENCE--Civics, Economics, History, Political Science, Social Studies, Psychology, Government, Library Science, Geography, Sociology

ATHLETICS--Coaching, Physical Education, Swimming

HOME ECONOMICS--Home Economics

NON-ACADEMIC--Dramatics, Art, Music, Speech, Theater

MISCELLANEOUS--Driver Education, Education, School Counselor, Administration

for the total sample combined is only $r_s = +.27$, which is not statistically significant.* Only the math department enjoys a level of autonomy that corresponds with its high prestige. Neither science nor English has the autonomy which its prestige might seem to warrant. It might be speculated that the degree of discrepancy between the prestige of a department and its autonomy is an important contributor to the rate of conflict.

Informal Leadership

The original questionnaire included a number of indices by which the "informal leaders" in each school might be identified. One item simply asks each respondent to "recall over the past year three teachers in this school whose ideas and opinions seem to have gotten the most support from other teachers." In another part of the questionnaire, the faculty was asked to name the teachers with whom they have consulted most frequently since the beginning of the school year for advice about a problem that has come up in connection with their classroom teaching, and to briefly describe the nature of the problems involved. Finally, office holders in professions, unions, or community organizations might be expected to be among the informal leaders, too, thus providing an independent criterion of leadership.

Considering only teachers mentioned at least once as having gotten the most support or as having been consulted, the linear correlation between the number of times which teachers were mentioned as having been consulted by other teachers and the number of times they were mentioned as having gotten the most support from other teachers is $r = .40$ ($N = 284$). That is to say, one measure explains only 16 per cent of the variance in the other measure. But while this is not a high correlation, it does mean that a small proportion of leaders have been identified by both measures; the *omitting the "miscellaneous" category.

two measures do not always identify the same persons but, a certain degree of confidence can be placed in those which have been identified by both procedures.

As a further comparison, both measures were compared with publicly recognized leadership. Table 5-16 shows the proportion of ninety-one officers (in the sample) in professions, unions, and community organizations, who were identified by each index of informal leadership. The rows show the percentages of the professional officers who were mentioned at least once by each index. For example, 64 per cent of the fifty professional officers were mentioned at least once as getting the most support. In all, 57 per cent of the ninety-one leaders were mentioned at least once as having been consulted and 53 per cent were mentioned at least once as having gotten the most support. Twenty per cent of the officers were not identified by either index. Excluding these officers who were not "validated" as informal leaders by either measure, 71 per cent of the remaining seventy-three leaders were identified by the consultation index and 65 per cent were mentioned as getting the most support.

The conclusion is that each of the measures does a reasonably good job of identifying persons who might be thought to exert leadership, those who have been officers in a profession, union, or the community. On the other hand, neither measure identifies all of the officers, although the consultation index has a slight advantage in the power to identify these officers. Despite the low correlation between the two measures, the overlap between these two indices and the external criterion of holding office suggests that they are each measuring some common basis of informal leadership, and that they are, in this sense, "valid." At least it is

Table 5-16

PROPORTION OF 91 OFFICERS IN PROFESSIONAL, UNION, AND COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS WHO WERE IDENTIFIED BY TWO INDICES OF INFORMAL LEADERSHIP

Index of Informal Leadership	Officer In			
	Profession N = 50	Union N = 6	Community Organization N = 35	Total N = 91
Number who were mentioned as getting most support	25 (50%) ^a	3 (50%)	20 (67%)	48 (53%)
Number who were mentioned as having been consulted	32 (64%) ^a	2 (33%)	18 (50%)	52 (57%)
Not mentioned on either measure	12 (24%)	2 (33%)	4 (11%)	18 ^b (20%)

^a The numbers in parentheses refer to the per cent of officers in profession, union and community who were identified by each of the measures.

^b Excluding the 20 per cent of officers who were not "validated" as informal leaders by either measure, 71 per cent of the remaining 73 were identified by the consultation index and 65 per cent were mentioned as getting the most support.

probably safe to consider persons who qualify on all three criteria among the actual leaders. On the other hand, since the correlation between these measures is far from perfect, it will be advisable to analyze each of the indices separately in more refined analyses.

Esteem

The esteem of teachers for one another has been estimated by tabulating nominations in response to the question, "Name three teachers in this school whose ideas about public education you respect the most." The correlation between this measure and the number of nominations for the most support from other teachers is $r = .50$ (considering only those who were mentioned at least once on either measure). That is, about one quarter of the variance in the degree to which teachers are highly esteemed is accounted for by their informal leadership status. Leadership and esteem as assessed by these measures seem to be related characteristics, but they are far from being identical. Therefore, leadership and esteem will be considered as independent measures in the remainder of the study.

The results of this relatively simple means of identifying the most respected teachers have been compared with a more systematic procedure. Respondents were provided with a list of every other teacher in the school and asked to indicate (by code number) on a five point scale how respected each of the other teachers in the school is. Teachers were then classified on both measures into four categories of respect -- high, high middle, low middle, and low. Only twenty-nine per cent of the teachers in the sample were identified in the same category on both measures. However, 62 per cent of them were coincidentally identified within two adjacent categories of each other (i.e., a "high" vs. "low" dichotomy). From an inspection of the distribution, it appeared that there is considerably more agreement about the "most respected" teachers than the average or least

respected. This suggests that the simple measure is a reasonably accurate means of identifying the small proportion of teachers who are most highly respected in the school, although it does not appear to be effective for rank ordering respondents below the upper extreme.

Sociometric Structure

Two procedures have been employed to identify the clique structure of schools. The simpler procedure attempts to delineate friendship patterns on the basis of responses to the question, "Name your three best friends at this school." The simple distribution of the number of nominations each teacher received was compared with the "popularity" of each teacher based on the frequency with which others said they saw them socially outside of work;* this second index is one part of a three part sociometric measure on which teachers are asked to indicate (on a five point scale ranging from "very often" to "not at all") how frequently they associate with each of the other teachers in the school in each of these situations: at coffee breaks, at lunch, and socially outside school hours. As a preliminary comparison, teachers were classified on each of these measures into four categories -- high, high middle, low middle, and low. Only twenty-seven per cent of the sample were classified identically on both measures, but 70 per cent of the teachers were classified in the same two adjacent categories (i.e., a "high" vs. "low" dichotomy). This suggests that there is a crude relationship between the two ways of measuring sociometric patterns in the schools. The more systematic measure has two major advantages over the simple one, however. It is probably more re-

*Popularity rating, of course, is not equivalent to clique structure; but it is assumed that if a measure can identify popularity rating, it can probably also identify friendship patterns. This assumption is subject to further analysis.

liable in identifying the teachers who are at neither extreme; and, more important, it provides three separate indices of interaction. Asking teachers to identify their friends does not identify coffee cliques or lunch groups which often arise because of time and space considerations in addition to friendships. The measures of clique formations over lunch and coffee pertain to the structurally defined patterns of informal interaction, which is a frequent setting in which interpersonal disputes occur.

ANALYSIS OF REPORTED CONFLICT INCIDENTS

Classification of the Interview Information

A total of 326 separate "incidents" have been identified from 146 interviews. Of this number, nearly half (159) involve one or more "open" and/or "heated" discussions with another party, or a "major incident" (which involved more than two parties). The remainder of the "incidents" concern general or specific complaints or forms of impersonal competition. Tentative categories have been formulated for classifying the interviews. After each conflict was classified in several ways by a member of the research staff, each classification was independently confirmed by another coder.

The Issues Involved

The major issue that is involved in each incident has been classified in several ways. Specific classifications have been grouped in terms of several general categories of issues. By coding the issues as specifically as possible, it has been possible to reorganize the specific conflicts in several ways. The specific classification of issues is outlined in Figure 5-6.

Figure 5-6

CLASSIFICATION OF THE ISSUES INVOLVED
IN THE 326 FRICTION INCIDENTS REPORTED
BY TEACHERS*

1. SCHOOL FINANCES

Growing expenses for school facilities and the program in general
Expenses for extra curricular activities

Expenses for curricular supplies and programs
Lack of money spent for the school in general
Cost of show tickets

2. CURRICULUM MANAGEMENT AND METHODS

Proper use of teaching techniques and procedures
Changing the curriculum
When and how to use audio-visual equipment
When and how to use field experiences
Organization of students' schedules for classes and outside work
The role of testing

Control over the physical aspects of the classroom
When and how to use final exams
The appropriate number of assemblies
The validity of one type of program over the other
Whether or not to give credit for a course
Control over day to day classroom procedure
Management of extra-curricular activities

3. AUTHORITY OVER THE CLASSROOM

Control over classroom work and subject matter to be taught
Control over inadequate teaching performance
Freedom of Speech

Control over classroom duties (assumed or assigned)
When and how to socialize with students (not in violation of legal codes)
Selection of textbooks

4. AUTHORITY WITHIN THE SCHOOL

Lack of fair trial or hearing
Inadequate opportunity to communicate with the central office
Teachers' right to time off for conventions
Influence of janitors in the school

Conflict over management and policies of department
Teachers spending too much time "off campus"
Teacher-Administration Relationships (general)

*Some of the incidents will be easily recognizable, some will be familiar to teachers only, while the descriptions of some are unavoidably vague in the abbreviated form in which it is necessary to list them here. This listing is merely intended to suggest some of the types of topics that were reported. A more detailed discussion and analysis of the incidents must await a more comprehensive sample and future reports.

5. DISCIPLINE, PROBLEMS AND ABILITY OF STUDENTS

Lack of student discipline -- general
 Competition among teachers for students to participate in extra-curricular activities
 Adequacy of the ability of graduates
 Student grades -- failure or low grades
 Student promotions
 Student behavior on final exams
 Student job placement
 "Personality clash" between student and teacher
 The appropriate treatment of students
 Suspension of students

Too much participation in extra-curricular activities
 Control over student guidance and behavior (other than official guidance work)
 Making and enforcing rules about student behavior
 Lack of student discipline as related to scholarship
 Students' "dropping courses"
 Students transferring between teachers
 Getting students out of class
 Amount of work given students (competition for their time)
 Student recognition and achievement
 Student Attendance

6. VALUE CONFLICTS -- MORAL, IDEOLOGICAL, AND INTERPERSONAL

Moral Impropriety (as defined by the community)
 Ethical impropriety (related to the school)
 Religious impropriety
 Conflict over the interpretation of subject matter
 Grade "fixing"
 Bias - racial
 Religious programs in the schools

Conflict over future plans of the teachers
 Views on social issues
 Bias -- economic, social class
 Misc. views on education not involving the school directly
 Incompatible personalities
 Socializing on the part of faculty
 Behavior and actions of faculty
 Interference in personal, social problems of other teachers
 Personal "irritations"

7. SCHEDULING PROBLEMS

Organization of classes -- time allotted
 Organization of classes -- amount of classes (in school day)
 Organization of classes - increasing enrollment
 Organization of classes -- priority of subjects to be taught
 Organization of classes -- intelligence of students (also sex and ability)
 Organization of school schedule -- days for school
 Competition for teacher's time when he has conflicting roles

Organization of classes -- number of classes per teacher
 Organization of classes -- time scheduled
 Organization of classes - organizing lunch hour time allotment
 Organization of extra curricular activities -- teachers' work loads
 Organization of classes -- amount of students (in a single class)
 Amount of school days
 Who will teach what
 Accessibility of administrators because of time pressures
 Scheduling "late" in the school year

8. SALARY AND ECONOMIC STATUS

Economic work conditions --(money, etc.)
 Pay not received (in violation of agreement of contract)
 Teachers desire for additional fringe benefits

Salary for self (inequality in proportion to felt need)
 Salary of others (inequality in proportion to others)
 Merit pay coupled with salary increases

9. DISTRIBUTION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

Lack of facilities and equipment
 Physical work conditions

Distribution of equipment between teachers or departments

10. POLICY

Disagreement over interpretation of a policy
 Lack of school policy -- general
 Operation of school -- general
 Lack of policy for getting students out of classes

Lack of clarity of job description
 Union rules regulating janitors' work
 Possibility of "change" in policy frightens older persons on staff
 Conflict over taking attendance

11. SCHOOL PHILOSOPHY

What is the "good of the school?"
 Emphasis on academic vs. physical education
 Emphasis on theater and music vs. academic
 Emphasis on child-centeredness (not necessarily a particular philosophy of education)

Emphasis of academic vs. vocational education
 Emphasis on athletics
 Domination of certain groups' attitudes in school affairs

12. STATUS

Promotion
 Position in organization
 Rivalry over colleges attended

Privileges for certain faculty member(s)
 Recognition for work accomplished
 Who is to teach the prestige courses

13. INTERNAL STRUGGLES WITHIN AND BETWEEN TEACHERS' ORGANIZATIONS

Competition for arbitration rights with the board between groups representing the teachers
 Complaint that AFT is anti-admin.
 Conflict over rules between the local and higher body of the organization
 Conflict over the defense of a member
 Competition over work assignments

Conflict over recruiting techniques used by organizations
 Competition for membership
 Conflict over methods used by organization (to get programs, etc.)
 Conflict over member's work performance in organization
 Conflict over the amount to request for raises
 General competition between two groups

14. SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS

Apathy of public or parents to
the school
Citizens criticize school (in
general)

Complaining on the part of citi-
zens about teachers' vaca-
tions

The preceding classification is only tentative at this point to illustrate the apparent diversity of issues. The conflicts can be classified in still other ways also. For example, twenty-four conflicts (seven per cent of the total) in the various categories involve questions about the appropriate function and priority of extra-curricular activities in the school -- such as getting students out of classes, conflicts over the management of extra-curricular activities, emphasis on athletics or theater, the expense of extra-curricular activities, the appropriate number of assemblies, students' over-participation in extra-curricular activities, the effect of extra-curricular activities on teachers' work loads, etc. It is also worth noting that about three per cent of the incidents involve competition for the time and loyalty of the students (for example, competing for students to engage in certain extra-curricular activities, unofficial efforts to control student guidance, priority among teachers to give extra work to students, students transferring or being transferred from one teacher to another). Only a small proportion of the conflicts (two per cent) could be directly attributed to "personality clashes."*

Intensity of the Incidents

Each incident was classified in terms of "intensity" from very minor personal irritations to open conflict and competition. The seven "levels of intensity" used are:

(1) General complaint; (for example, "I don't like the school, or the way things happen around here").

*That is, incidents which did not involve an issue.

(2) Complaint against a specific group, individual or their policy; (for example, a teacher complains that the administration has just installed a 25-minute lunch period).

(3) "Open" discussion of the problem between the parties involved.

(4) At least one "heated" discussion among the parties involved.

(5) More than one "heated" discussion among the parties involved.

(6) A "major incident" in which the parties other than those initially involved in the dispute are drawn into the dispute itself.

(7) Impersonal competition (for example, a teacher tries "too hard" to be promoted over a teacher with more seniority).

For most purposes, the term "friction incident" will be used in conjunction with all levels of intensity, but the primary concern will be with categories (3), (4), and (5). These three categories have been combined for most analyses. "Complaints" and "impersonal competition" will also be retained as separate categories of analysis.

Frequency Distributions

The frequency of each type of issue has been tabulated for the schools in the study (Table 5-17). The single most frequent type of incident involves discipline, problems, and ability of students (15.6 per cent of the 326 incidents that were reported). Almost as frequent are incidents involving authority over the classroom (13.8 per cent). Each of the other categories accounts for less than 10 per cent of the incidents.

These categories, in turn, have been grouped into three major types of conflicts that are typical of organizations: conflict over authority, distribution of facilities and work schedules, and value conflicts (Table 5-17). Authority problems have been divided into those involving the teacher's authority within the school, and authority over the teacher's classroom work. Authority

within the school includes three categories: with respect to superiors (i.e., the category "authority within the school"), with respect to the public (i.e., "school-community relations"), and with respect to peers (i.e., "internal problems among teachers' organizations"). Authority over the classroom pertains to "curriculum management and classroom management" (which tends to involve relation with superiors primarily), and to subordinates (i.e., problems with students). These groupings are at present only approximate and need further refinement, but they illustrate a point of departure for analyzing friction incidents.

About half of the 326 friction incidents reported (48.7 per cent) involve complaints or disputes over teachers' authority. Nearly 17.5 per cent of all of the incidents are over either curriculum management or the classroom in general. About 15.5 per cent of the incidents concern students, student discipline and academic problems primarily. In all, about one-third of all of the incidents involve this area of the classroom, either with respect to superiors or to students. About seven per cent are over the teachers' authority within the school (but outside of the classroom). Then, nearly a fourth of the 326 reported incidents involve the teacher's authority, either over the classroom or in the school in general.

Perhaps even more significant, of the 159 incidents that have been classified as more tense, overt incidents -- i.e., involving one or more "open" or "heated" discussions of a "major incident" -- one quarter of the issues concern the authority of teachers over the classroom, the curriculum, or within the school.

These gross and preliminary figures provide independent evidence of the confusion and conflict that is occurring within the public schools over the teacher's proper place within the administrative and professional systems. Many of these conflicts over what

is the proper authority of teachers over their classrooms and within the school undoubtedly lie at the heart of the professional and employee role conflicts hypothesized at the outset of the study.

Not all of the issues, however, pertain so directly to the authority of teachers to control the major decisions that affect their work, although even many of the other issues, which usually involve competition among teachers themselves, reflect on their authority, and indirectly concern their ability to control their own work. About a fourth of the issues involve the distribution of other scarce rewards, such as income, job prestige, preferred teaching schedules, and allocation of resources to the educational program. Ten per cent of all of the incidents involve scheduling problems, such as the teaching load, who teaches what, the appropriate distribution of the teacher's time, etc. Slightly more of the issues (13 per cent) concern the teacher's economic and job status. But, contrary to the general complaining that teachers presumably do about their salary, only eight of the 326 conflicts (2.5 per cent) involve salary problems directly. Moreover, only 1.5 per cent of all of the incidents (many of them complaints) concern the economic status of the educational program in general; i.e., a lack of finances to support the school program, etc. By comparison, fourteen of the conflicts (3.2 per cent) concern the distribution of physical facilities among teachers, and over 7 per cent (24) involve job status, such as competition for favored positions in the organization, privileges of certain faculty members, recognition for work accomplished, and promotion.

Twenty-two per cent of the issues could be classified as involving either the personal values or the educational philosophies of teachers. Slightly more than 8.5 per cent of these incidents

**FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE OF INCIDENTS INVOLVING AUTHORITY,
THE DISTRIBUTION OF SCARCE REWARDS, AND VALUES, BY LEVEL OF INTENSITY**

Type of Issue Involved	INTENSITY					TOTALS		
	Number of General Complaints	Number of Complaints Against a Person or Group	Number of Open or Heated Discussions or Major Incidents	Number of Impersonal Competition Incidents	Number Unclassifiable	Total No.	Proportion of all Incidents	
I. Authority, Total	6	49	81	9	14	159	48.7	
A. Over the classroom								
1. with respect to superiors (curriculum management and authority over classroom)	3	12	35	4	3	57	17.4	
2. with respect to subordinates (student discipline and problems)	1	16	23	3	8	51	15.6	
B. Within the school								
1. with respect to superiors (authority over the school)	0	14	7	0	1	22	6.8	
2. with respect to public (school-community relations)	1	3	2	0	0	6	1.8	
3. with respect to peers (disputes among teachers' organizations)	1	4	14	2	2	23	7.1	
II. Distribution of Scarce Rewards, Total	3	17	48	3	11	82	25.2	
A. Teachers economic and job status (salary problems, distribution of physical facilities and job status)	1	10	23	2	7	43	13.1	
B. Scheduling Problems	2	6	21	1	4	34	10.4	
C. Economic Status of the Educational Program (school finances)	0	1	4	0	0	5	1.5	
III. Value Conflicts, Total	4	31	26	3	8	72	22.1	
A. Moral, ideological and interpersonal issues	2	12	9	0	5	28	8.6	
B. Educational Philosophy	2	7	3	3	1	16	4.9	
C. School Policy	0	12	14	0	2	28	8.6	
IV. Unclassifiable (Insufficient Information)	0	2	4	0	7	13	3.9	
TOTAL NUMBER	13	99	159	15	40	326	----	
PROPORTION OF ALL INCIDENTS	4.0	30.3	48.8	4.6	12.2	----	99.9	

involve moral, political, or ideological issues, or such interpersonal problems as the tendency for teachers to interfere in one another's personal life, incompatible personalities and socializing among the faculty. Nearly five per cent of the conflicts involve the educational philosophy of teachers and another 8.6 per cent apparently concern translating that philosophy, personal values and role conceptions into school policy.

About 4 per cent of the issues could not be classified on the basis of the above categories, because the informants were unable to provide sufficient information about either the intensity of the disputes or the exact content of the issue.

Conflict Between Roles.

Each conflict also has been coded specifically in terms of the role relationships of the parties involved.* Table 5-18 reports the frequency with which incidents occur between role partners, by level of intensity. As might be inferred from the frequency of disputes over authority reported in the preceding table, 44.5 per cent of the incidents are between teachers and their administrative superiors. One-half of these involve one or more open or heated discussions or a major incident. Of the total number of teacher-administrator incidents, the bulk is between teachers and their principals or principals' assistants; but eight of them have occurred between teachers and the board and twenty-two of them involve what might be termed "line-staff" problems, such as conflicts between a teacher and the attendance officer or the financial officer.

A substantial proportion of the incidents, nevertheless, are confined to the teachers themselves. Approximately one-third of the 326 incidents reported have occurred between teachers. Very few of them can be directly attributed to either age or sex roles (two or

*For each incident, up to five persons involved in either a major or a minor way have been recorded. Information on the other parts of the questionnaire is available for analyzing the characteristics of everyone who becomes involved in these incidents.

Table 5-18

FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE OF FRICTION INCIDENTS
BETWEEN ROLE PARTNERS, BY LEVEL OF INTENSITY

Type of Role Involved	Intensity					Totals	
	Number of General Complaints	Number of Complaints Against an Individual or Group	Number of Open, Heated Discussions or Major Incidents	Number of Impersonal Competition Incidents	Number of Unclassifiable Incidents	Total Number	Proportion of all Incidents
I. Teacher-Administration:							
Total	2	48	76	4	15	145	44.5
Teacher-Board	0	4	4	0	0	8	2.5
Teacher-Administrator	2	37	62	3	11	115	35.3
Line-Staff	0	7	10	1	4	22	6.7
II. Teacher-Teacher:							
Total	3	24	57	8	20	112	34.4
General	2	12	43	2	12	71	21.8
Non-Academic	1	10	14	5	8	38	11.7
Male-Female	0	1	0	0	0	1	0.3
Young-Old	0	1	0	1	0	2	0.6
III. Teacher-Student:	0	3	5	1	1	10	3.1
IV. Teacher-Public:	3	5	13	1	0	22	6.7
V. Unclassifiable:	5	19	8	1	4	37	11.3
TOTAL NUMBER	13	99	159	15	40	326	----
PROPORTION OF ALL INCIDENTS	4.0	30.4	48.8	4.6	12.3	----	100.0

three per cent), but a surprisingly large proportion of them (12 per cent of all incidents and about a third of all those confined to teachers), involve at least one teacher in athletics or the "non-academic" program (i.e., drama, art, music, speech, theater). This fact suggests that the position within the organization does play an important role in producing some conflicts -- perhaps more important than such latent roles as age and sex.

While nearly 16 per cent of the issues concern student discipline and other problems, very few have actually involved teachers and students directly (3.1 per cent). While students are the subject of a great deal of dispute, the incidents themselves primarily concern teachers and other authorities, at least as the teachers see it.

Nearly 7 per cent of the incidents (22 of them) involve the personnel of the school with some member of the public. Almost 60 per cent of these teacher-public incidents involve either open or heated discussions or a major incident -- further demonstration that teachers are attempting to usurp more control and authority over education.

It might also be noted that about 45 per cent of the incidents involve groups of teachers. Teachers organizations are involved in over 7 per cent of all disputes, and extra curricular teachers are involved in over 7 per cent of the incidents.

Other Classifications

Almost any coding procedure tends to obscure the complexity and dynamics of the incidents. In an attempt to overcome some of the over-simplification inherent in coding, each friction incident has been classified in several other ways. The initial reactions of the parties involved, for example, have been coded into several categories. In about 17 per cent of the incidents, the problem was delegated upward;

for example, it was decided to let the principal handle it, or to abide by the ruling of the superintendent's office. In only six of the incidents was the problem delegated downward, for example to the student council. In about 7 per cent of the incidents the parties avoided the situation, either by refusing to speak to one another or by leaving the school system. In 10 per cent of the conflicts, there was an apparent segmentalization of the issue from the normal daily routine: for example, the parties ignored the fact that they were opposed to one another, or they overtly rationalized the fact that their friction was "normal" or not important. In the vast majority of the cases however (63 per cent), there was an attempt between the parties involved to discuss the problem, either directly, or indirectly. Thus, in about two-thirds of the cases there was direct recognition of the problem and confrontation of the issue between the parties involved. However, in at least a third of the cases there has been an attempt either to delegate, avoid or segmentalize the problem. This raises the question, under what conditions is each type of issue reacted to in each way?

Incidents also have been coded as either "episodic" (a problem that has come up only once) or "recurrent" (a problem that has come up repeatedly in the school). This classification refers to the same problem, independent of the parties who might have been involved previously. It can be compared to another classification which refers to the "history of the problem" and concerns whether or not the individuals who are involved in one conflict have been involved in previous conflicts of any one type.

Finally, whenever it could be determined, the "outcome" of each incident has been recorded in terms of the party that won, the disposition (such as whether or not one party was fired or reprimanded,

whether the issue was clarified or a compromise reached), and whether there has been a decision.

The Problem of Validating Incident Reports

Corroboration

The problem of validating reports of friction incidents may be approached in several possible ways; some of them were utilized by Lazarsfeld and Theilens in their study of the academic mind (7). It was assumed that those incidents which are "corroborated" (i.e., reported by two or more persons independently in substantially the same form) have actually occurred. If all incidents had been corroborated, there would be no problem; but only eight per cent of the incidents (22) reported in the present study have been corroborated (Table 5-19). This low rate of verification does not mean that the uncorroborated reports are invalid, however. Corroboration has been determined conservatively. Not only was it necessary for the same type of incident to be mentioned more than once, but it was necessary for the respondents to have described the same particulars. For example, if more than one respondent described a dispute between parties A and B over the emphasis on athletics, it was considered to be corroborated. But if the one respondent mentioned only the stress on athletics as a general problem which had created disputes, without mentioning the specific incident between A and B, it was not considered to be a corroborated incident.

In general, there is a great deal of consensus in each school at the level of general issues that divided the faculty. If a high proportion of the overt disputes at a school, for example, involved disproportionate pay for certain teachers or administrators, then a high proportion of respondents also would have reported a general complaint about this kind of problem even if they could not describe

Table 5-19
THE RATES OF FRICTION INCIDENTS REPORTED IN INTERVIEWS
AND CORROBORATION AND RELIABILITY OF REPORTS, BY SCHOOL

School	Sample		Rates		Open, Heated Discussions and Major Incidents					Corroboration			
	Number Interviewed	Per Cent of Staff Interviewed	Total Number of Incidents Reported	Total Number of Incidents Per Interview	Number Reported Per Interview	Rank Order	Per Cent of Total Number of Incidents	Rank Order	Number of Teacher-Administrator Incidents Per Interview	Rank Order	Per Cent of Incidents Corroborated	Per Cent of Non-corroborated Incidents Reported by "Reliable" Respondents ^a	Total Per Cent of Corroborated and Reliable Incidents
1	33	.45	43	2.90	1.06	5	37.2	6	.33	4.5	.09	.15	.24
2	53	.49	29	1.12	.58	6	51.7	3	.12	6	.28	.62	.90
3	20	.75	47	3.13	1.46	2	46.8	4	.67	3	.06	.73	.79
4	47	.21	7	.70	0.0	7	0.0	7	.00	7	.14	.33	.47
5	63	.63	81	2.02	1.1	4	54.3	2	.33	4.5	.05	.42	.47
6	119	.24	73	2.61	1.2	3	46.2	5	.71	2	.04	.19	.23
7	89	.13	46	3.83	2.3	1	60.7	1	1.17	1	.04	.41	.45
TOTALS	424	.34	326	2.23	1.1		48.8		.42		.08	.39	.47

^a A "reliable" respondent is one who corroborated at least one other incident

specific disputes. Therefore, what is in question are the particulars of specific cases and not the basic conclusions. Moreover, in this exploratory phase of the research, the purpose has been to seek out as many examples of conflicts as possible in the interest of collecting a large range of incidents; consequently, during the forty minute interviews little time could be devoted to checking on their validity. Further attention will be given to the problem of corroboration during subsequent phases of the field work.

Lazarsfeld and Theilens suggest that more credence can be given to uncorroborated incidents if they have been reported by teachers who have corroborated at least one incident (7). Within each of the sample size groups in their sample, the respondents who reported the corroborated incidents were also those who most often reported uncorroborated cases. Similarly in the present study, 39 per cent of the uncorroborated incidents have been reported by "reliable" respondents (i.e., those who reported one of the corroborated incidents). Nearly half of the incidents, then, are either corroborated or reported by reliable respondents.

The percentage of incidents corroborated is partially a simple function of the proportion of the staff interviewed in each school. A rank order correlation for the seven schools between these two variables is $r_s = +.67$, which approaches statistical significance at the five per cent level; if it is significant, the proportion of the staff interviewed would explain about 44 per cent of the variance in reliability. If so, many of the non-corroborated incidents can be attributed to small samples in some of the schools rather than to distorted reports. It is probably advisable to interview about one-third of the staff at each school in order to provide a more adequate opportunity for corroboration.

It has been demonstrated, then, that eight per cent of the incidents are corroborated and an additional 39 per cent have been

reported by "reliable" respondents. Further, it has been shown that the failure to corroborate at least some of the remaining incidents can be attributed to the fact that small proportions of the school staffs were interviewed at some schools, and to the stringent criteria of corroboration that has been used.

However, even if this indirect evidence of reliability is accepted, between 25 and 50 per cent of the incidents still have not been corroborated or verified in any way. The problem can be approached in still another way. The basic consideration is whether the presence of a large proportion of non-validated incidents in a sample affects the ultimate conclusions that are reached from that sample. If there were a significant difference between the conclusions reached from the corroborated, the reliable, and the non-corroborated and non-reliable reports, the answer would be yes. Therefore, the distributions of types of reports have been compared; the frequencies for each type of role partner involved at various levels of intensity have been tested by chi square. Tables 5-20a and 5-20b report the distributions. Neither of the chi squares is significant. While non-significant chi squares do not in themselves confirm chance as the explanation, sometimes proof must consist of the inability to deny a statement; there is little reason to believe that the non-validated and validated incidents are providing different conclusions.

Independent Measures of Conflict Rates

An accurate assessment of the validity of interview reports must also take into consideration whether or not conclusions based on them differ from conclusions based on independent evidence. It is especially important to determine whether or not the rate of conflict within each school, as it is estimated from the interviews, is consistent with the conflict rate estimated from other sources.

Table 5-20a

FREQUENCY OF THE OCCURRENCE OF VALIDATED, RELIABLE AND
NON-VALIDATED REPORTS OF INCIDENTS AT EACH LEVEL OF INTENSITY

	Validated	Reliable	Non-validated	Total
Complaints	7	48	57	112
Open, Heated Discussions or Major Incident	15	48	96	159
Competition	0	4	11	15
TOTAL	22	100	164	286*

*Unclassifiable have been omitted
 $\chi^2 = 7.17$; 4 d.f.; not significant

* - * - * - * - * - * - * - * - * - * - * - * - * - * - * - * - * - * - *

Table 5-20b

FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE OF VALIDATED, RELIABLE AND
NON-VALIDATED REPORTS OF FRICTION INCIDENTS BETWEEN ROLE PARTNERS

| | Validated | Reliable | Non-validated | Total |
|---|-----------|----------|---------------|-------|
| Teacher-Administration
(Including Board and
Line-Staff) | 8 | 50 | 87 | 145 |
| Teacher-Teacher (Except
Non-academic) | 8 | 24 | 45 | 77 |
| Teacher--Non-academic | 3 | 14 | 21 | 38 |
| Teacher-Parents, Students | 3 | 9 | 20 | 32 |
| TOTAL | 22 | 97 | 173 | 292* |

*Unclassifiable have been omitted
 $\chi^2 = 2.6$; 6 d.f.; not significant

Before this question could be answered, it was necessary to find a reasonable index of the rate of staff conflict which is not entirely a function of the methodology used. The number of conflicts reported increases directly with the number of the staff interviewed, independently of either the size of the school's staff or the proportion of the staff that was interviewed (Table 5-19). That is, although the proportion of the staff interviewed may have a bearing on securing a measure of the reliability of the reports, interviewing a high proportion of the staff does not insure that a large number of conflicts will be reported. However, as might be expected, the number of conflicts reported in a school is a direct function of the number of interviews conducted there. The rank order correlation between the number of incidents reported and the number of interviews is $r_s = +.72$ (significant at $P .05$). It is concluded that the most meaningful measure of the rate of conflict at a school is the number of incidents reported per interview. Probably a minimum but uniform number of interviews should be conducted at each school, independently of its size.

Global Indices. Several independent indices from the questionnaire can be used to cross-check the rates of conflict derived from the interviews. For example, a set of global items was included in the questionnaire to which respondents were instructed to indicate, "On the whole, how much tension exists between each of the following groups in your school?" Information was elicited for thirteen types of roles, among them several categories of teacher-administrative roles, and several categories for teacher-teacher roles, and teacher-student roles (see Appendix IIg for the complete list). The alternatives for each of the thirteen roles, which range from "severe," "moderate," "slight," to "none", were weighted from three to zero in

the order listed. The number of responses in the school to each alternative has been multiplied by the weight of the alternative and the sum divided by the number of respondents in the school, multiplied by thirteen (the number of items). The resulting school mean is the average item response of the global tension for all role partners in the school. The means of the seven schools have been ranked from high to low (Table 5-21). It should be noted that in all schools the mean response is between "none" and "slight"; in no school do respondents, on the average, feel that there is even "slight" tension. However, this varies by role and by school (e.g., the mean on administrative positions is 1.22 for school 3). For the total sample, 18 per cent of the respondents mentioned "severe" or "moderate" tension on at least one of the roles.

The rank order correlation between the total number of incidents reported per interview and this global measure from questionnaires is $r_s = .82$ (significant at $P > .05$). (see Table 5-22). Moreover, the rank order correlation between global tension and the rate of open or heated discussions and major incidents reported per interview is $r_s = +.93$ (significant at $P .01$). In other words, the global measure provides conclusions about the gross rates of conflict in the schools which are very similar to those derived from the interviews; but it is more closely associated with the intense disputes than with either complaints or impersonal competition. In short, the global measure provides essentially the same conclusions about the rate of intense friction as the interviews do.

These results have been cross-checked further using a more systematic procedure. In the questionnaire, every respondent was provided with a list of his colleagues (by code number) and was asked to indicate (a) "the degree of tension" that exists between him and

TABLE 5 - 21

CONFLICT RATES IN THE SCHOOLS,
BASED ON GLOBAL MEASURES OF TENSION IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE

| School | | Global Measures of Tension | | | | | |
|-------------|------------|----------------------------|------------|---|------------|-------------|------------|
| Code Number | Staff Size | Between Specified Roles | | Between Individuals
Percent Mentioning | | | |
| | | Mean ^a | Rank Order | Severe or Moderate ^b | Rank Order | Severe Only | Rank Order |
| 1 | 33 | .49 | 5 | .43 | 3 | .03 | 5 |
| 2 | 53 | .47 | 6 | .10 | 7 | .02 | 6 |
| 3 | 20 | .75 | 1 | .27 | 5 | .09 | 4 |
| 4 | 47 | .08 | 7 | .24 | 6 | .00 | 7 |
| 5 | 63 | .64 | 3 | .60 | 2 | .15 | 2 |
| 6 | 119 | .54 | 4 | .28 | 4 | .11 | 3 |
| 7 | 89 | .72 | 2 | .89 | 1 | .33 | 1 |

^a 0 = none; 1 = slight; 2 = moderate; 3 = severe. (This is the average of the number of respondents x the weight, divided by the number of roles x the number of respondents).

^b This is the total number of times severe or moderate tension with other faculty members is mentioned in proportion to the total number of respondents.

each of the other staff members, and (b) the number of open disagreements and disputes (if any) that he has had with each other staff member since the beginning of the school year. The alternatives are the same as in the preceding instrument. The rank order correlation between the proportion of respondents in the school listing "severe" or "moderate" tensions (combined) on part A and the overall number of disputes reported on part B of the questionnaire is $r_s = +.86$ (see Table 5-22); that is, the number of disputes reported includes both

MATRIX OF SELECTED RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS BETWEEN INDICES OF RATES OF
STAFF CONFLICT ELICITED FROM INTERVIEWS AND QUESTIONNAIRES^a

| Indices of Staff Conflict | Number of Open, Heated Discussions or Major Incidents Reported Per Interview | Open, Heated Discussions and Major Incidents---Per Cent of Total Number of Incidents | Open, Heated Discussions and Major Incidents---Number of Teacher-Administrator Incidents Per Interview | Total Number of Incidents Per Interview | Mean Global Tension | Number of Disputes Per Respondent | Per Cent of Respondents Mentioning Severe Tension Between Themselves and Another Person | Per Cent of Respondents Mentioning Severe or Moderate Tension Between Themselves and Another Person | Per Cent of Respondents Involved in Disputes |
|---|--|--|--|---|---------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Number of Open, Heated Discussions and Major Incidents Reported Per Interview | | | | | | | | | |
| Open, Heated Discussions and Major Incidents---Per Cent of Total Number of Incidents | | | | | | | | | |
| Open, Heated Discussions and Major Incidents---No. of Teacher-Administrator Incidents Per Interview | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Number of Incidents Per Interview | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean Global Tension | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Disputes Per Respondent | | | | | | | | | |
| Per Cent of Respondents Mentioning Severe Tension Between Themselves and Another Person | | | | | | | | | |
| Per Cent of Respondents Mentioning Severe or Moderate Tension Between Themselves and Another Person | | | | | | | | | |
| Per Cent of Respondents Involved in Disputes | | | | | | | | | |

^a Using the Spearman Rank Order Correlation Method; see Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics (McGraw Hill Book Company, 1956), "Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient", pp. 202-213.

* Significant at $P > .05$

** Significant at $P > .01$

"severe" and "moderate" ones.

Only school 3, the smallest school in the sample, has a noticeably different rank using this procedure compared to the global measure of tension between roles.* The rank order correlation between the global tension measure between roles and the proportion mentioning "severe" tension between individuals is $r_s = +.79$; the correlation with the proportion mentioning "severe" and "moderate" tension combined is lower, $r_s = +.57$. That is, again the global measure of tension between roles seems to assess severe tensions better than severe and moderate ones combined.

There is no perceptable rank order correlation between the number of disputes reported in the questionnaires per respondent and the number of incidents reported in the interviews. However, there is a positive rank order correlation between the proportion of respondents mentioning "severe" and "moderate" tension (combined) and the total number of incidents per interview is $r_s = +.65$; although it approaches statistical significance, this correlation is not quite significant at the .05 level. But, when the schools are ranked only on the basis of the proportion mentioning "severe" tension, the rank order correlation with the number of open or heated discussions and major incidents per interview is $r_s = +.86$ (significant at $P > .05$).

When the schools are ranked in terms of the rates of open or heated discussions and major incidents that specifically involve teachers and administrators, and compared with the rate of respondents mentioning severe tension, the correlation is statistically significant

*In the second procedure, which considers only conflict between individuals, every conflict is considered to be of equal importance, thereby obscuring the significance of teacher-administration conflicts. Independent observation indicated that there is a great deal of tension in school 3; reports are that there has been a high rate of turnover within a few months after the field work was completed.

at a level approaching .01 ($r_s = +.89$). It is also significant that the proportion of respondents reporting "severe" tension is associated with the rank of the schools on global tension for the thirteen roles described in the preceding section ($r_s = +.75$). Moreover, there is a significant rank order correlation ($r_s = +.75$) between the proportion of persons involved in disputes as elicited from the questionnaire and from the interview materials.

To the extent that the two methods provide similar conclusions, credence can be given to the interview reports. However, it appears that the rates of conflict based on the interviews pertain to "severe" rather than to "moderate" conflicts, at least as respondents define those terms. In this sense, the questionnaires provide a measure that interviews do not -- the degree of moderate tension existing in the schools. On the other hand, although questionnaire and interview materials provide essentially the same results in ranking the schools on the rates of severe conflict, it has not been possible to accurately classify either the issues involved or their intensity from the brief descriptions of incidents in the questionnaire. Only with respect to the proportion of incidents between teacher and administration or board and the percentage of conflicts involving non-academic teachers was there a significant positive rank order correlation between the incidence rates of different measures in the schools. In all other cases, the chi square difference between the way the content was coded from questionnaire and from interview data is significant at the .001 level of probability. While each method identified a similar number of incidents (246 from questionnaires and 289 from interviews), a much higher proportion of incidents could be identified as teacher-administrative conflicts in the interviews than in the questionnaires, while the proportion of teacher-

teacher conflicts was over-estimated on questionnaire tabulations. Also, the categories of school-authority and school-community relations were grossly under-estimated in the questionnaires compared to the interviews, while curriculum management problems were over-estimated in the questionnaires.

These differences in the conclusions reached from questionnaires and interviews can be attributed to the fact that respondents' descriptions of incidents in the questionnaires were too brief to provide sufficient, systematic information. In the interviews, the interviewer was able to probe for the essential information. In that sense, the interview accounts not only appear to be as valid, but are essential to the purposes of this study; while it is possible to make reliable estimates of the rates of conflict from questionnaire materials alone, the interview materials are necessary for analyzing the content of the materials. These more extended accounts are also of considerable utility for interpreting the questionnaire analyses and for suggesting refinements of the major hypotheses.

Frequency of Disputes With the Principal. The questionnaire includes still another indicator of the degree of tension and compliance in the schools which can be compared with the various measures of the conflict rates based on interview analysis. For example, one part of the questionnaire asks teachers to indicate how frequently they have had contacts with the principal, and how frequently these contacts have involved disputes. The schools were rank ordered on the basis of the proportion of teachers saying that contacts with the principal or assistant principal involved disputes. A positive rank order correlation of $r_s = +.68$ (which closely approaches significance at $P > .05$) exists between the number of open or heated discussions or major incidents per interview and this questionnaire

measure (Table 5-23). There is an even higher, positive rank correlation of $r_s = +.86$ (significant at approximately $P > .02$) between the total number of conflicts reported per interview and the proportion of teachers saying that contacts with the principal or his assistants involved disputes.

The rank order correlation between that measure and the number of open or heated discussions or major incidents per interview specifically involving teachers and the administration is $r_s = +.64$, which is slightly too low to be statistically significant at the .05 level. However, there is a significant rank order correlation between the percentage of all incidents that are reported between teachers and the administration or school board and the proportion of teachers saying that contacts with principal or assistant principal involved disputes ($r_s = +.71$). It is interesting that there is no correlation between the questionnaire measure and the proportion of incidents involving authority in the school and classroom or over the curriculum; the questionnaire measure seems to be most associated with value conflicts ($r_s = +.89$) and conflicts over policy and philosophy ($r_s = +.74$).

Disputes With the Public. Respondents were also asked to indicate how frequently they see the parents of their students and how frequently these contacts have involved disputes. Again, the schools were rank ordered in terms of the proportion of teachers saying that contacts with parents often have involved disputes. The rank order of schools on this measure was compared with the number of open or heated discussions or major incidents per interview involving the public. The correlation is $r_s = +.62$, which is in the expected direction but is not statistically significant at $P > .05$. However, the rank order correlation between this particular questionnaire measure and the number of incidents per interview is significant

Table 5-23

RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS BETWEEN RATES OF CONFLICT COMPUTED FROM
INTERVIEW REPORTS AND FROM INDEPENDENT INDICATORS OF CONFLICT IN QUESTIONNAIRES^a

| Independent Indicators of
Conflict and Compliance | Content of Conflict | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|--|---|--|---|--------|
| | Number of Incidents Per
Interview | Number of open, heated dis-
cussions or major incidents
per interview | Number of open, heated dis-
cussions or major incidents
per interview -- Teacher-
Administration | Proportion of open, heated
discussions or major incidents
between teacher and the admin-
istration or board | Proportion of incidents
between teachers | Proportion of incidents, open
discussions, one or more
heated discussions, or a
major incident | Proportion Involving
Student discipline | Proportion Involving
Value Conflict | Proportion Involving
Authority, school and
classroom and curriculum | Proportion Involving
Scheduling Conflicts | Proportion Involving
Policy and Philosophy | |
| | Proportion of teachers saying contacts
with Principal or Assistant Principal
involve disputes | + .86** | + .68 | + .64 | + .71* | -.39 | -.00 | -.36 | +.89** | +.00 | -.29 | +.74* |
| | Proportion of teachers saying contacts
with parents often involved disputes | + .68 | + .71* | + .54 | + .17 | + .11 | -.39 | -.07 | +.54 | -.14 | -.43 | +.90** |
| | Proportion of teachers checking at least
one negative statement about the
Principal | +.89** | +.75* | +.85* | +.63 | -.18 | +.32 | -.79* | +.75* | -.18 | +.14 | +.40 |
| Proportion of teachers who mentioned
that compliance most impresses the
Principal | -.69 | -.56 | -.54 | -.80* | +.60 | +.80* | +.39 | -.92** | -.19 | +.17 | -.79* | |

^a Using the Spearman Rank Order Correlation Method; Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics (McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1956), "Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient", pp. 202-213.

* Significant at $P > .05$.

** Significant at approximately $P > .02$.

at $P > .05$ ($r_s = +.71$). It is probably significant that the rank order correlation between the proportion of teachers saying that contacts with parents have involved disputes and the percentage of the total number of the conflicts in the school involving policy and philosophy is $r_s = +.90$. That is, the teachers' relationship with parents either seems to reflect internal problems, or parent-teacher conflicts aggravate existing differences of opinion in the school.

Negativism Toward the Principal. On the questionnaire, teachers were provided with a list of descriptive statements about principals, a few of which are negative. Schools were ranked on the basis of a proportion of teachers checking at least one negative statement about their principal. Using this index in contrast to the questionnaire measure just discussed, there is a positive and significant rank order correlation between the proportion of teachers checking at least one negative statement about the principal and (1) the number of open, heated discussions and major incidents per interview ($r_s = +.75$), and (2) the number of open, heated discussions or major incidents per interview involving teachers and administrators ($r_s = +.85$); on the other hand, the rank order correlation between the proportion of teachers checking at least one negative statement about the principal and the proportion of conflicts between teachers and the administration or board is too low to be significant (though it is in the positive direction), even though that correlation was significant using the other questionnaire measure (Table 5-23).

In other words, considering the preceding two questionnaire measures of dissent with the principal in the schools, the latter measure provides significant positive correlations where the former does not, and the reverse. Between the two of them, they tend to validate the measures of conflict rates with the administration inferred from the interviews.

Stress on Compliance. On the questionnaire, respondents were asked to indicate in their own words what types of behavior most impresses and least impresses their respective principals. Their responses were classified into several categories on the basis of content analysis; one of the categories of behavior which was frequently mentioned as impressing the principal the most encompasses the general idea of "compliance." As might be expected, the proportion of the teachers who mention that compliance most impresses the principal is negatively associated with the proportion of conflicts between teachers and the administration or school board ($r_s = -.80$; significant at $P > .05$). On the other hand, it is interesting that there is a positive correlation ($r_s = +.79$) between the proportion of the teachers who mention that compliance most impresses the principal and the proportion of conflicts involving open discussion, one or more heated discussions, or a major incident. This finding seems reasonable if it is interpreted in the light of the first finding.

That is, if compliance is stressed in the schools, then when disputes do occur, they are likely to be intense. However, the more violent conflicts are not necessarily with the administration; in fact, the rank order correlation between the extent to which compliance is stressed and the number of open or heated discussions or incidents per interview is negative, though it is not statistically significant ($r_s = -.54$). It is revealing that the relationship between the proportion of the teachers who mention that compliance most impresses the principal and value conflicts and conflicts over policy and philosophy are inversely related; but what the content of the major incidents is has yet to be determined.

To sum up, several independent indices of the rate of conflict within schools tend to confirm the conflict rates computed as the number

of incidents reported per interview. However, the interview measure seems to be somewhat more valid for assessing the more intense types of incidents involving open, heated discussions or incidents involving other parties.

Chapter 5

REFERENCES

1. Bidwell, Charles, "Some Effects of Administrative Behavior: A Study in Role Theory," Administrative Science Quarterly, 2 (1957), pp. 161-181.
2. Chase, Francis S., "Factors for Satisfaction in Teaching," Phi Delta Kappan, 33 (November 1951), p. 127 ff.
3. Getzels, J. W., and Guba, E. G., "The Structure of Roles and Role Conflict in the Teaching Situation," Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 29 (September 1955).
4. Gross, Neal; Mason, Ward S., and McEachern, Alexander W., Explorations in Role Analyses: Studies of the School Superintendency Role (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958), pp. 281-318.
5. Hoppock, Robert, Job Satisfaction (New York: Harper and Co., 1935).
6. Korber, George W., "Role Conflict and Personality," (letters to the editor), American Journal of Sociology, LVII (July 1959), pp. 48-49.
7. Lazarsfeld, Paul F., and Theilens, Wagner, Jr., The Academic Mind (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1958).
8. Marriotte, R., "Size of Working Group and Output," Occupational Psychology, 23 (1949), pp. 47-57.
9. Mason, Ward S., The Beginning Teacher: Status and Career Orientations, Final Report on the Survey of New Teachers in the Public Schools, 1956-57 (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1961).
10. Meltzer, Leo, and Salter, James, "Organizational Structure and Performance and Job Satisfaction," American Sociological Review, 27 (June 1962), pp. 351-336.
11. Miller, Delbert C., and Schull, Fremont A., Jr., "Administrative Role Conflict Resolutions," Administrative Science Quarterly (September 1962), pp. 143-160.
12. Schultz, Raymond, "Keeping Up Teacher Morale," Nation's Schools, 50 (October 1952), pp. 53-56.
13. Stouffer, Samuel A., "An Analysis of Conflicting Social Norms," American Sociological Review, 14 (December 1949), pp. 707-717.
14. Tallachi, Sergio, "Organization Size, Individual Attitudes and Behavior: An Empirical Study," Administrative Science Quarterly, 5 (December 1960), pp. 398-420.
15. Worthy, James C., "Organizational Structure and Employee Morale," American Sociological Review, 15 (1950), pp. 169-179.

Chapter 6

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

This chapter is devoted to a preliminary and cursory inspection of the data as they apply to the thesis that professionalism is a militant process occurring within the context of bureaucratic organizations. The purpose of this analysis is not to arrive at systematic conclusions, but to determine the feasibility of pursuing the general thesis more systematically in a future phase of the study. The chapter is organized in two parts: (1) an analysis of the school sample, and (2) the respondent sample analysis.

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATES AND CONFLICT

Components of Professional Climates

Configurations of the structural and behavioral characteristics and the value orientations that are peculiar to an organization can be euphuistically referred to as the organization's "climate." Even though it is partly a function of individuals, the "climate" -- in this global and sensitizing sense -- may be regarded as an independent organizational property, like its size or the degree of centralization it has achieved. Thus, even so personal a characteristic as status orientation, in which there is considerable variability within some schools, can be considered to be an organizational property. Likewise, the level of professionalism and the degree of militancy found within an organization may be regarded as conditions of that organization's "climate." Professionalism in turn can be viewed as a composition of a large variety of independent characteristics; something can be learned about the professional climate by examining even a selected few of all characteristics that logically comprise it. A profile of some of these characteristics that probably contribute to the professional

climates of schools is reported in Table 6-1. The rank order correlation between each characteristic and the mean professional and employee orientation expressed by the staff of each school is reported in the table.

If professionalization represents a vocation's attempt to gain autonomy, it might logically be expected that a professionally oriented faculty stresses academic freedom. This is true in one sense. The proportion of faculty stressing a need for more academic freedom for students correlates positively with the mean professional scale score ($r_s = +.92$, which is significant at $P .01$).^{*} However, it is not associated with the proportion who express a need for more academic freedom for teachers; on the other hand, the proportion of a staff who are simultaneously high in professional and low in employee orientation is positively correlated with the proportion who express a need for more academic freedom for teachers ($r_s = +.79$, which is significant at $P > .05$).

The contrast in these two findings illustrates the importance of considering configurations of professional-employee orientations within organizations. It is not only necessary to

^{*}The questionnaire item states "Please check one characteristic below which you feel most needs greater emphasis in your school -- increased salaries, promotion of deserving teachers, teachers' tenure, academic freedom of students, academic freedom of teachers."

Throughout this section, the correlation (r_s) refers to Spearman rank order correlation. See Signey Seigel, Nonparametric Statistics (McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1956), pp. 202-213. It should be noted that the range of mean professional scores among the seven schools is small and concentrated at the upper end of the continuum. Presumably, a wider range could explain more of the variances.

Table 6-1

RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS BETWEEN MEAN PROFESSIONAL AND EMPLOYEE ORIENTATIONS OF THE FACULTIES OF THE SCHOOLS AND OTHER COMPONENTS OF PROFESSIONAL CLIMATES (N = 7)^a

| Components of Professional Climates | Mean Professional Scale Score | Proportion Simultaneously High Professional and Low Employee | Mean Employee Scale Score | Proportion Simultaneously Low Professional and High Employee |
|---|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------|--|
| Proportion of the faculty expressing a need for more academic freedom for:
students | +.92** | +.11 | -.29 | -.29 |
| teachers | -.31 | +.79* | -.50 | +.04 |
| Proportion who published professional articles | +.64 | +.41 | -.14 | +.04 |
| Proportion of graduates attending college | +.21 | +.39 | -.59 | -.04 |
| Proportion of the student body which drops out of high school | +.48 | -.03 | +.67 | +.72* |
| Proportion of staff:
active in professional associations | -.69 | +.16 | +.18 | +.32 |
| members of a union | +.14 | +.79* | -.61 | .00 |
| holding office in a community organization | -.19 | +.29 | +.75* | +.54 |
| Proportion feeling that each goal should be most emphasized: | | | | |
| critical thinking | -.42 | +.39 | -.18 | -.14 |
| vocational training | -.59 | +.29 | +.12 | +.56 |
| knowledge of subject | -.92** | -.25 | +.36 | +.39 |
| character training | +.83* | -.18 | -.11 | -.29 |
| getting along w/others | +.60 | -.21 | +.21 | +.21 |
| Difference between the proportion of the faculty who think each goal should be and is emphasized: | | | | |
| critical thinking | +.14 | +.68 | +.07 | +.43 |
| vocational training | +.67 | +.00 | -.57 | -.54 |
| getting along w/others | +.12 | -.62 | +.05 | -.37 |
| citizenship | +.74* | +.08 | -.42 | -.51 |
| knowledge of subject | +.29 | +.14 | +.18 | +.11 |

*Significant at $P > .05$, $N = 7$. ($P_{.05} = .714$).

**Significant at $P > .01$, $N = 7$. ($P_{.01} = .893$).

^aThe Spearman Rank Order Correlation Method was used; see Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics (McGraw Hill Book Co., 1956), "Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient", pp. 202-213.

understand what a faculty is for, but to ascertain what it is against.* For, in this case, it is not the degree of professionalism itself that is of most significance, but whether or not that professionalism is accompanied by a negative orientation toward the employee status. However, the literature on role conception has tended to neglect this kind of interplay between contrasting value systems.

It is similarly true that, while neither professional nor employee orientations are significantly associated with the proportion of the student body which drops out of school (although the correlation with employee orientation approaches significance at the .05 level,

$r_s = +.67$, there is a significant positive correlation with the proportion of the faculty that is simultaneously low professional and high employee in orientation ($r_s = +.72$). The employee orientation, particularly when accompanied by a low professional one, is adversely associated with professional productivity. (It should also be noted that the correlation between employee orientation and proportion of graduates attending college is inverse, although it is not statistically significant). Perhaps, schools with a high dropout rate attract this type of teacher, or perhaps this type of orientation tends to depress the productivity.

A few of the characteristics that are commonly considered in association with professionalism are not significantly associated with this particular measure of professional orientation. The correlation of professional orientation with the proportion of the staff who have published professional articles does not quite reach significance at the five per cent level, although the correlation

* Francis has recently pointed to the significance of this in terms of the "anti-model." Francis, Roy G. "The Anti-Model as a Theoretical Concept," The Sociological Quarterly (Fall 1963), pp. 197-205.

is positive and approaches significance ($r_s = +.64$). Also, although participation in community organizations is often considered by school administrators to be a mark of the professional status of a faculty, it is noteworthy that the proportion of a faculty holding office in community organizations is associated not with its professional concept, but with its employee conception ($r_s = +.72$). The net effect of recruiting teachers who participate in community activities may be to attract a faculty that is disproportionately employee oriented rather than one that is necessarily professionally oriented.

The pattern of relationship between membership in professional associations and unions is also a curious one. The rank order correlation of professional orientation with the proportion of a faculty who have been active in professional associations, though not statistically significant, is negative; while the proportion high in professional and low in orientation is significant and positively associated with union membership. Does this indicate that it is the more professionally oriented teachers, not the employee oriented ones, who join unions? Does the militancy of the labor union movement attract the teachers who themselves are professional militants?

Further insight is gained into professional climates by comparing each school's professional orientation with the proportion of teachers who feel that different goals should be and are being emphasized. The proportion of each faculty which emphasizes vocational training as a goal is not significantly correlated with any of the measures of status orientation (although it may be significant that the correlation between the proportion of the faculty expressing that goal and the proportion simultaneously low in professional and high in employee orientation is of the same magnitude as the

professional orientation but in the opposite direction).^{*} However, the mean professional score is positively associated with emphasis on character training as a goal ($r_s = +.83$), and inversely associated with the proportion of faculty feeling that knowledge of subject matter should be emphasized ($r_s = -.92$). While a professional's own status is based on a monopoly of knowledge, the teachers' goals as they see their work center more around character training than imparting knowledge.^{**}

Schools also have been ranked in terms of the difference between the proportion that said each goal should be emphasized and the proportion that said it is emphasized in education. Teachers feel that knowledge is over-emphasized and critical thinking is under-emphasized. About 38 per cent of the sample said that critical thinking should be emphasized, but only 7 per cent said that it actually is emphasized in their schools. On the other hand, one quarter of the sample said that subject matter should be emphasized, but 47 per cent said that it actually is emphasized. About three per cent of the sample said that vocational training should be emphasized in education more than it is.

The proportion of the faculty who think that critical thinking is under-emphasized is positively associated with the proportion who are simultaneously high in professional and low in employee orientation ($r_s = +.68$), although this falls short of statistical significance. Similarly, the rank order correlation between the mean

^{*} Specifically, the question asks the respondent to rank six goals of education in terms of (1) emphasis each should be given, and (2) emphasis that is actually given to them.

^{**} This is probably true of most professions; or more precisely, most professional groups can probably be divided into those committed to professional knowledge as an end in itself, as opposed to those who attempt to apply this knowledge directly for the sake of improving the immediate welfare of individual clients.

professional score and the difference between what teachers think should be, and is emphasized with respect to vocational training is positive and approaches significance ($r_s = +.67$). Professionally oriented teachers tend to feel that vocational training is over-emphasized; but significantly, it is faculties in schools in which the professional orientation is not only high but the employee orientation is also low, which tend to feel that critical thinking should be more emphasized than it is.

Professional Climates and Conflict Rates

Several of the components of professional climates are associated with the various rates of conflict reported in the schools (Table 6-2). However, the pattern of association is not entirely consistent. There is a positive rank order correlation between stress on academic freedom for students and both the number of incidents per interview and the number of open or heated discussions or major incidents per interview, ($r_s = +.71$ and $r_s = +.75$, respectively). Stress on academic freedom for students appears to be particularly associated with disputes over policy and philosophy of education ($r_s = +.94$). However, contrary to expectation, stress on academic freedom for teachers is not associated with rates of conflict.* Moreover, the proportion of teachers in a school who have published professional articles is not, as might be expected, positively associated with the number of incidents per interview; rather the association is negative ($r_s = -.71$).

Faculties which are professional in the sense of having published articles are not belligerent, while those which are professional in the sense of stressing academic freedom for students are belligerent. Perhaps this apparent inconsistency is due to the fact that a faculty which publishes has different goals than one which stresses academic freedom for students. Certainly the goals of critical thinking and

*Yet, if the proportion of students who drop out can be considered to be an index of professional productivity, it is directly associated with this kind of conflict.

Table 6a2

RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS BETWEEN CONFLICT RATES IN THE SCHOOLS
AND COMPONENTS OF PROFESSIONAL CLIMATES (N = 7)

| Components of Professional Climates | Rates of Conflict | | | Content of Conflict ^a | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| | Number of Incidents Per Interview | Number of Open or Heated Discussions or Major Incidents Per Interview | Number of Open or Heated Discussions or Major Incidents Per Interview Between Teachers and Administrator | Proportion of Incidents Involving Student Discipline | Proportion of Incidents Involving Value Conflicts | Proportion of Incidents Involving Authority over School, Classroom, and Curriculum | Proportion of Incidents Involving Scheduling | Proportion of Incidents Involving Policy and Philosophy |
| Proportion of the faculty expressing a need for more: | | | | | | | | |
| academic freedom for students | +.71* | +.75 | +.58 | -.14 | +.57 | -.36 | -.21 | +.94** |
| academic freedom for teachers | -.21 | -.04 | +.03 | -.07 | -.57 | -.54 | +.50 | -.47 |
| Proportion who published professional articles | -.71* | -.64 | -.67 | +.39 | -.86* | +.14 | -.18 | -.58 |
| Proportion of graduates attending college | +.21 | +.09 | -.14 | -.14 | +.14 | -.75* | +.36 | +.04 |
| Proportion of the student body which drops out of high school | -.44 | -.60 | -.46 | -.33 | -.04 | -.71* | +.01 | -.24 |
| Proportion of staff active in professional associations | -.68 | -.75* | -.74* | +.18 | -.57 | +.39 | -.18 | -.42 |
| Proportion of staff who are members of a union | -.07 | +.18 | +.21 | -.14 | -.43 | -.71* | +.57 | -.29 |
| Proportion holding office in a community organization | -.21 | -.39 | -.33 | -.21 | +.21 | +.82* | -.29 | +.14 |
| Proportion feeling that each goal should be most emphasized: | | | | | | | | |
| critical thinking | -.14 | -.00 | +.14 | +.54 | -.57 | +.11 | +.11 | -.76* |
| vocational training | -.71* | -.74* | -.71 | -.03 | -.40 | -.10 | +.56 | -.26 |
| knowledge of subject matter | -.86* | -.86* | +.74 | +.21 | -.50 | +.25 | +.43 | -.69 |
| character training | +.71 | +.50 | -.37 | -.11 | +.68 | -.04 | -.54 | +.74* |
| getting along with others | +.71* | +.46 | -.54 | -.61 | +.96** | -.11 | +.25 | +.56 |
| Difference between the proportion of the faculty who think each goal should be and is most emphasized: | | | | | | | | |
| critical thinking | +.43 | -.43 | +.64 | -.84 | +.25 | -.04 | +.39 | +.51 |
| vocational training | +.71* | +.71* | +.64 | -.04 | +.43 | +.71* | +.11 | +.35 |
| getting along with others | -.24 | -.76* | -.52 | +.67 | -.06 | +.22 | -.64 | +.36 |
| citizenship | +.51 | +.76* | +.58 | +.00 | +.22 | -.44 | -.19 | +.71* |
| knowledge of subject matter | +.61 | +.43 | +.58 | -.57 | +.46 | +.29 | -.21 | -.04 |

^aBased on content analysis of the interview reports. This refers to the proportion of the total number of conflicts in the school that pertain to each of these types of issues.

*Significant at P .05 (P_{.05} = .714), N = 7

**Significant at P .01 (P_{.01} = .893), N = 7

knowledge seem to be differentially associated with the rate of conflict. For example, the proportion of a faculty which feels that knowledge of subject matter should be most emphasized is inversely associated with the number of conflicts per interview ($r_s = -.86$), the number of open or heated discussions or major incidents per interview ($r_s = -.86$), and the number of open or heated incidents involving teachers and the administration ($r_s = -.74$).*

Apparently the goals of vocational training (which is inversely related to all three rates of conflict) and of knowledge do not nurture the kind of conflict that, for example, emphasis on character training and (ironically) getting along with others do. Both of these goals are positively associated with the number of conflicts per interview; the positive correlation between the latter goal and the proportion of value conflicts is especially notable ($r_s = +.96$). On the other hand, the proportion of a faculty which feels that either vocational training or citizenship is over-emphasized is directly associated with the number of open or heated discussions or major incidents per interview, while the difference between the extent to which the faculty feels that getting along with others would be stressed and the extent to which it is stressed is negatively associated with the number of open or heated discussions or major incidents per interview. Whether or not a faculty is active in community organizations does not seem to be generally associated with rates of conflict, although it might have been expected that participation in community affairs would reduce the conflict rate; the one significant correlation (with the proportion of all conflicts

*Moreover, although the correlation is not in itself statistically significant, a positive correlation between stress on the goal of knowledge and the proportion who publish articles ($r_s = +.55$), may help to explain at least part of the difference.

concerned with the teacher's authority) is positive.

Neither the proportion of the faculty who are members of unions nor of professions is positively associated with the conflict rate, despite the fact that unions, in particular, have the reputation of being militant. On the contrary, the number of open or heated discussions or major incidents per interview is negatively associated with the proportion of the staff who are members of a profession, and there is no reliable association between the proportion of the faculty that belongs to a union and rates of conflict; as a matter of fact, the proportion of all conflicts over the teacher's authority in the school or in the classroom, or over the curriculum is inversely related to the proportion of the staff who are members of the union.

On the other hand, in another analysis (not reported in Table 6-2), it was found that there is a positive rank order correlation between the proportion of teachers who are members of a union and the percentage of all conflicts in each school which have involved open or heated discussions or major incidents ($r_s = +.79$). The contrast in this last set of findings with the previous set can be interpreted in terms of the structure of conflict found in unionized schools. The existence of grievance procedures can minimize the number of conflicts in unionized schools, but the same structure provides sufficient group support to aggravate the conflicts that do break out, a high proportion of which involve open or heated discussions or major incidents. The image of the unionized school as being one that is fraught with conflict is probably not an accurate one; but at the same time, the union does provide a structure which not only minimizes the total number of overt conflicts, but which simultaneously maximizes the intensity of the conflicts that do occur; it is this type of conflict which is publicized.

Professional Conception and Conflict Rates

If the pattern of association between the rates of conflict and the various indices of professionalism is inconclusive, the correlations of mean professional conceptions and indicators of compliance with rates of conflict more consistently demonstrate the thesis that professionalism is a militant process. The schools were arbitrarily divided into "High" professional orientation (two schools), "Middle" (three schools) and "low" (two schools) professional orientation on the basis of their rank on that measure. The rates of conflict reported per interview for each category of schools is shown in Table 6-3. The two "high" professional schools (combined) are also the highest on all three measures of conflict rate. For the two types of rates concerned with intense conflicts the converse is also true; low professional schools have gross rates of open or heated discussions or major incidents which are four times lower than the high professional schools; and the rate of conflict in low professional schools, on this type of intense conflict between teachers and the administration, is eight times lower than in the two schools with high professional orientations. The one exception is that schools with professional orientations near the middle of the distribution have the lowest rate of gross conflicts per interview.

The reverse also tends to be true. That is, when the schools were grouped into "high," "middle" and "low" categories on the basis of each type of conflict rate, on two of the measures of conflict rate a low, but significant mean professional scale difference was found between the high conflict and low conflict categories ($C.R. = 1.657$;

Table 6-3
RATES OF CONFLICT IN SCHOOLS WHOSE FACULTY HAVE HIGH, MIDDLE AND LOW PROFESSIONAL ORIENTATIONS

| Level of Professional Orientation | Rate of Incidents Per Interview | | Rate of Open, Heated Discussions or Major Incidents Per Interview | | Rate of Open, Heated Discussions or Major Incidents Per Interview Involving Teachers and Administrators | |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------|---|-------------|---|-------------|
| | Conflicts | Interviewed | Conflicts | Interviewed | Conflicts | Interviewed |
| High
Schools 3 and 7
$\bar{X} = 58.69$ | 93 | 27 | 50 | 27 | 24 | 27 |
| Middle
Schools 1, 5, and 6
$\bar{X} = 57.17$ | 131 | 83 | 94 | 83 | 38 | 83 |
| Low
Schools 2 and 4
$\bar{X} = 56.76$ | 102 | 36 | 15 | 36 | 4 | 36 |
| Total | 326 | 146 | 159 | 146 | 66 | 146 |
| | | | 2.23 | 1.08 | 0.45 | 0.45 |
| | | | 3.44 | 1.85 | 0.88 | 0.88 |
| | | | 1.58 | 1.13 | 0.46 | 0.46 |
| | | | 2.83 | 0.42 | 0.11 | 0.11 |

significant at $P > .05$, one tail test).*

The rank order correlation between the number of conflicts per interview and a school's mean professional orientation is $r_s = +.91$, which is significant approaching the one per cent level (Table 6-4). The mean professional scale score of each school also is correlated with the number of open or heated discussions or major incidents per interview ($r_s = +.85$), and with the number of open or heated discussions or major incidents between teachers and administrators ($r_s = +.71$). The professional scale scores are associated with the proportion of all conflicts involving values, which approaches the significance at the five per cent level ($r_s = +.69$). The fact that the differences among some of the schools are not large could imply that even a slight increase in professional orientation is associated with an increase in conflict rates, at least at the upper end of the continuum where most of the mean scores of the schools in the sample tend to cluster.

The fact that professional orientation is positively associated with rates of conflict does not imply that employee orientation is negatively associated with the incidence of conflict. Most of the correlations are too low to be significant, although there is one negative association between the mean employee score and the proportion of conflicts involving the teachers' authority ($r_s = -.86$); also, the proportion of teachers simultaneously low in professional and high in employee orientation is inversely correlated with the proportion of conflicts that involve student problems and discipline

*High (two schools) $\bar{X} = 58.7$; $s^2 = 36$, $N = 36$; Middle (three schools) $\bar{X} = 57.2$, $s^2 = 25$, $N = 162$; Low (two schools) $\bar{X} = 56.7$, $s^2 = 23$, $N = 59$. On the rate of open, heated discussions or major incidents per interview involving teachers and administration, the difference is not statistically significant.

Table 6-4

RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS BETWEEN MEAN PROFESSIONAL AND EMPLOYEE
CONCEPTIONS AND RATES AND CONTENT OF CONFLICTS IN THE SCHOOLS (N = 7)

66

| Type of Conception | Rate of Conflict | | | Content of Conflicts | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| | Number of Incidents Per Interview | Number of Open or Heated Discussions or Major Incidents Per Interview | Number of Open or Heated Discussions or Major Incidents Involving Teachers and Administrators | Proportion of Conflicts Involving Student Discipline | Proportion of Conflicts Involving Value | Proportion of Conflicts Involving the Teachers' Authority in the School Classroom and over Curriculum | Proportion of Conflicts Involving Scheduling | Proportion of Conflicts Involving Policy or Philosophy |
| Mean Professional Conception | +.91** | +.85* | +.71* | +.24 | +.69 | -.42 | -.24 | +.71* |
| Proportion Simultaneously High Professional - Low Employee | +.18 | +.21 | +.26 | -.43 | -.18 | -.50 | +.36 | +.26 |
| Mean Employee Conception | +.29 | +.54 | +.14 | +.36 | -.29 | -.86* | -.14 | +.14 |
| Proportion Simultaneously Low Professional - High Employee | -.25 | -.36 | -.15 | -.71* | +.25 | +.39 | +.64 | -.15 |

*Significant at $P > .05$ ($P_{.05} = .714$), $N = 7$

**Significant at $P > .01$ ($P_{.01} = .893$), $N = 7$

($r_s = -.71$); moreover, an independent analysis (not reported in Table 6-4) showed that the proportion of all conflicts in each school involving open or heated discussions or major incidents is positively associated with the proportion of faculty simultaneously high professional and low employee oriented ($r_s = +.75$).

Positive rank order correlations between mean professional scale scores and several independent measures of conflict that were computed from questionnaire data provide further independent confirmation that the level of professional orientation of a school is positively associated with conflict (Table 6-5). Professional orientation is positively associated with the proportion of the faculty saying that contacts with the principal or assistant principal have involved disputes ($r_s = +.85$), and with the proportion saying that contacts with parents have involved disputes ($r_s = +.90$).* Also, a positive correlation between mean professional scores and the proportion of teachers checking at least one negative statement about the principal (from a list of seven positive and three negative statements describing administrative practices) approaches significance at the five per cent level ($r_s = +.67$).

Conversely, a school's mean professional score is inversely associated with the proportion of teachers who, when asked to indicate in their own words what they can do that would "most impress the principal," mentioned some form of "compliance" ($r_s = -.72$); professionalism does not appear to flourish in environments where compliance is stressed. Although the style of organizing the professional and employee roles does not seem to be associated with any

*Specifically, respondents were asked to estimate the number of times they had talked with principals, assistant principals and parents during the past year, and whether or not these contacts "have often involved disputes."

of these independent indicators of conflict or compliance, in another analysis (not reported in Table 6-5) it was found that the proportion of the faculty in a school who are "rebellious" or "contrary," as measured by the initiative and compliance scale is positively associated with the proportion of the teachers who are simultaneously high in professional and low in employee orientation ($r_s = +.82$).

Bureaucratic Characteristics and Rates of Organizational Conflict

Rates of conflict in schools, of course, cannot be explained entirely in terms of the status orientation of the faculties. The bureaucratic context, which permits or restrains the fulfillment of those orientations, also must be taken into account. Certain bureaucratic characteristics are themselves associated with conflict rates. Table 6-6, which reports a matrix of rank order correlations between the various conflict rates and some structural characteristics of the schools, shows a discernible association between various indices of standardization and certain rates of conflict. For example, average class size tends to be positively correlated with the number of conflicts per interview, the number of open or heated discussions or major incidents per interview and the number of open or heated discussions or major incidents per interview involving teachers and the administration; however, none of these correlations (which range between $r_s = +.67$ and $r_s = +.69$) quite achieves the .05 level of significance. More significant are the positive rank order correlations between the emphasis on rules and procedures in a school and the proportion of all conflicts in a school that involve differences over values ($r_s = +.94$), and policy and philosophy ($r_s = +.85$). That is, there is not only a tendency for the conflict rate to be higher in schools with larger classes, but there is a definite association between the stress placed on rules and procedures and the

proportion of the conflicts that occur over values and philosophy.

Also, there is an inverse rank order correlation between the stress placed on rules and procedures and interchangeability (combined) and the proportion of all conflicts that involve student discipline, although again the correlation does not quite reach significance at the five per cent level ($r_s = -.68$).

The amount of specialization in a school appears to be associated with the amount of conflict as well. The number of part time teachers in a school is positively associated with the number of open or heated discussions and major incidents per interview involving teachers and administrators ($r_s = +.91$). Also, the number of part time teachers was found to be positively associated with the proportion of all conflicts in a school that involve non-academic teachers (not reported in the table). Although the proportion of teachers teaching courses in which they did not major does not appear to be significantly associated with conflict rates, the proportion of a staff teaching one or more courses in which they neither majored nor minored in college is positively associated with the number of open or heated discussions and major incidents per interview ($r_s = +.72$).

It is interesting to speculate on the implications of these two sets of findings. Standardization and specialization represent alternative ways of providing for a division of labor. On the one hand, stressing rules and procedures seems to activate conflicts at the level of values, policy and philosophy; but on the other hand, unless a division of labor rests on at least some measure of technical competence, the overall rate of conflict tends to be relatively high. A more intensive study of these problems would permit a comparison of the effects that combined patterns of rules and procedures and specialization have on rates of conflict. For example, for a given level of professionalism, does stress on rules and procedures

aggravate conflict primarily in schools that are relatively specialized, and does stress on rules and procedures tend to minimize conflict in schools where technical specialization has not been achieved? The answer to such questions would provide insight into the conditions under which stress on rules and procedures is effective and when it is not effective.

It also appears that centralization of the decision-making process is, under some conditions, associated with some types of conflict. For example, centralization of decision-making over the prerogatives of professionals is inversely associated with the proportion of all conflicts involving student discipline ($r_s = -.79$), and it is directly associated with the proportion of problems involving scheduling ($r_s = +.71$). However, centralization of professional types of decisions is curiously unrelated to conflict rates, in violation of one of the initial assumptions of the study. On the other hand, centralized control over non-professional types of decisions is positively associated with the number of open or heated discussions or major incidents per interview involving teachers and administrators ($r_s = +.71$)*

The number of open or heated discussions or major incidents per interview involving teachers and administrators is also positively associated with another index of centralization -- i.e., the number of full time administrators in a school ($r_s = +.70$) -- which approximates significance at the .05 level. However, the ratio of the number of administrators to teachers in a school does not appear to be associated in any significant way with any of the indices of conflict.

In contrast to the centralization of professional decisions,

*Also, another analysis (not reported in the table) showed that centralization over non-professional decisions is positively associated with the proportion of all conflicts in a school that involve teachers and the administration or school board ($r_s = +.89$).

centralization of non-professional decisions is positively associated with the proportion of the conflicts in a school involving student discipline or problems ($r_s = +.75$), and it is also positively associated with the proportion of incidents involving values ($r_s = +.89$). The association between centralization as measured by the decision-making authority of teachers on the professional orientation scale is also positively associated with the proportion of conflicts involving values ($r_s = .89$).

Finally, it is interesting that although organization size is often associated with the concept of bureaucratization, size is generally not directly associated with rates of conflict in the schools; the one possible exception to that statement is a low positive rank order correlation ($r_s = +.66$, not reported in Table 6-5), between size of the school (as measured by the number of full time teachers) and the proportion of all the conflicts in the school that involve line and staff personnel. While size is usually taken as a crude indicator of bureaucratization, and, while many types of organizational problems are commonly believed to be associated with size, size itself does not seem to directly contribute much to rates of conflict.

In summary then, the major bureaucratic characteristics, at least as measured by some of the indices, are associated with organizational conflict, although the pattern now appears to be relatively complex. One possible implication at this point is that bureaucratic characteristics contribute to rates of organizational conflict independently of the status orientations of the faculty. However, this hypothesis merits further examination, because in other analyses (not reported here), the characteristics themselves appeared to be associated with professional and employee conceptions. For example, a statistically significant positive rank order correlation exists in the sample

be " the mean professional scale score and the amount of stress in the school on rules and procedures; and there is a positive correlation between the stress on rules and procedures and interchangeability (combined) and the proportion of the staff that is simultaneously low in professional, and high in employee orientation. Similarly, the proportion of the faculty simultaneously low in professional and high in employee orientation appeared to be associated with centralization of professional decisions. It is possible, in other words, that at least some of the apparent association between bureaucratization and the rates of conflict can be attributed to a combination of certain types of role conceptions associated with bureaucratized organizations. The analysis of this speculation must await a larger sample.

Table 6-5

RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS BETWEEN MEAN PROFESSIONAL AND EMPLOYEE CONCEPTIONS AND RATES OF CONFLICTS IN SCHOOLS COMPUTED FROM QUESTIONNAIRE MEASURES (N = 7)

| Types of Conception | Indicators of Conflicts | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| | Proportion of teachers saying contact with Principal or Ass't. Principal involved disputes | Proportion of teachers saying contacts with parents often involve disputes | Proportion of teachers checking at least one negative statement about the Principal | Proportion of teachers who mention that compliance most impresses the Principal |
| Mean Professional Scale Score | + .85* | + .90** | + .67 | - .72* |
| Proportion High Professional-Low Employee | - .25 | + .00 | + .39 | + .42 |
| Mean Employee Scale Score | + .07 | - .18 | - .04 | - .35 |
| Proportion Low Professional-High Employee | + .14 | - .32 | + .14 | - .06 |

*Significant at $P > .05$ ($P_{.05} = .714$), $N = 7$

**Significant at $P > .01$ ($P_{.01} = .898$), $N = 7$.

Table 6-6

BUREAUCRATIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SCHOOLS AND RATES AND TYPES OF CONFLICT
(N = 7)

| Bureaucratic Characteristics | Rates of Conflict | | | Type of Conflict | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| | Number of Incidents Per Interview | Number of Open or Heated Discussions or Major Incidents Per Interview | Number of Open or Heated Discussions or Major Incidents Per Interview Between Teachers and Administrators | Proportion of Incidents Involving Student Discipline | Proportion of Incidents Involving Value Conflicts | Proportion of Incidents Involving Authority Over School, Classroom and Curriculum | Proportion of Incidents Involving Scheduling | Proportion of Incidents Involving Policy and Philosophy |
| STANDARDIZATION | | | | | | | | |
| Average Class Size | +.67 | +.67 | +.69 | -.15 | +.62 | -.22 | +.03 | +.67 |
| Rules and Procedures | +.29 | +.42 | +.42 | -.58 | +.94** | +.04 | +.15 | +.85* |
| Rules and Procedures and Interchangeability | +.00 | +.07 | +.03 | -.68 | +.36 | +.64 | +.04 | +.24 |
| SPECIALIZATION | | | | | | | | |
| Number of part time teachers | +.66 | +.88* | +.91** | +.34 | -.34 | +.39 | -.23 | -.28 |
| Per cent teaching one or more courses in which they did not major | +.14 | +.32 | +.26 | +.14 | +.36 | +.46 | -.36 | +.58 |
| Per cent teaching one or more courses in which they did not major or minor | +.44 | +.72* | +.64 | +.04 | +.33 | -.22 | +.01 | +.63 |
| CENTRALIZATION | | | | | | | | |
| Decision-Making, Professional decisions (Part VI) | +.11 | -.00 | +.15 | -.79* | +.61 | +.11 | +.71* | +.40 |
| Decision-Making, Non-Professional decisions (Part VI) | +.64 | +.57 | +.71* | +.75* | +.89* | +.14 | +.32 | +.53 |
| Decision-Making, Authority (Mean, Part V) | +.49 | +.49 | +.58 | -.56 | +.81* | +.40 | +.10 | +.62 |
| Number of full time administrators in the school | +.38 | +.64 | +.70 | -.13 | -.26 | -.25 | +.05 | -.29 |
| Ratio of administrators to teachers in the school | -.36 | -.25 | -.06 | -.57 | +.04 | +.39 | +.64 | -.06 |
| SIZE | | | | | | | | |
| Number of full time teachers | +.00 | +.29 | +.46 | -.39 | -.25 | -.00 | +.39 | -.31 |

*Significant at $P > .05$ **Significant at $P > .01$

Heterogeneity and Turnover and Rates of Organizational Conflict

It also appears that the amount of heterogeneity and turnover in the schools, perhaps independently of the professional climate and bureaucratic characteristics, is associated with organizational conflict rates. The rank order correlations between rates of conflict and an index of heterogeneity (discussed in the preceding chapter) and turnover rates are reported in Table 6-7. There is a rank order correlation between the total number of teachers added to the staff since 1958 and the number of open or heated discussions or major incidents per interview involving the teachers and the administration ($r_s = +.95$). Conversely, there is an inverse correlation between the mean number of years a faculty has been employed in a school and both the rate of open or heated discussions or major incidents per interview ($r_s = -.82$), and the number of open or heated discussions or major incidents per interview involving the teachers and administrators ($r_s = -.71$). In other words, staff expansion and turnover tends to increase intense conflict between teachers and the administration, while stability of the faculty tends to minimize it.

It may also be worth noting that the proportion of conflicts between line and staff personnel is positively associated with the total number of teachers added to the staff since 1958, although the correlation does not quite reach the five per cent level of significance ($r_s = +.66$). Line-staff relationships are frequently especially ambiguous and likely to be "sore spots" that are subject to aggravation by tension producing factors, such as high rates of turnover.

The total heterogeneity ratio is positively associated with the proportion of all conflicts in a school that involve open or heated discussions or one or more major incidents ($r_s = +.75$). The ratio of locals to cosmopolitans, in particular, is also positively

Table 6-7

RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS BETWEEN RATES AND TYPES OF CONFLICT AND INDICATORS OF HETEROGENEITY AND STAFF EXPANSION AND TURNOVER IN THE SCHOOLS (N = 7)

| Heterogeneity Index
and
Staff Expansion and Turnover Rates | Number of Incidents Per
Interview | Number of Open or Heated Dis-
cussions or Major Incidents
Per Interview | Number of Open or Heated Dis-
cussions or Major Incidents
Per Interview Between Teachers
and Administrators | Proportion of Conflicts
Between Line and Staff | Proportion of Incidents Invol-
ving Open Discussion, One or
More Heated Discussions or a
Major Incident | Proportion of Incidents Invol-
ving Student Discipline | Proportion of Incidents Invol-
ving Value Conflicts | Proportion of Incidents Invol-
ving Authority over School,
Classroom and Curriculum | Proportion of Incidents Invol-
ving Scheduling | Proportion of Incidents Invol-
ving Policy and Philosophy |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Number of Teachers Added to
Staff Since 1958 | +0.00 | +0.29 | +0.53** | +0.66 | +0.43* | -0.64 | -0.25 | -0.00 | +0.39 | -0.31 |
| Mean Number of Years the Faculty
Has Been in the School | -0.57 | -0.82* | -0.71 | -0.07 | -0.43 | -0.21 | -0.18 | +0.18 | +0.43 | -0.42 |
| Heterogeneity Ratio, Total | +0.18 | +0.21 | +0.26 | +0.61 | +0.75* | -0.43 | -0.18 | -0.50 | +0.36 | -0.06 |
| Local-Cosmopolitan Ratio, Subtotal | +0.14 | +0.04 | +0.21 | +0.71* | +0.07 | -0.71* | +0.20 | +0.21 | +0.71* | +0.56 |

*Significant at $P > .05$

**Significant at $P > .01$

associated with the proportion of conflicts between the line and staff, and with the proportion of conflicts that involve scheduling ($r_s = +.71$); and this ratio is negatively associated with the proportion of conflicts involving student discipline or problems ($r_s = -.71$). This association with line-staff conflicts may arise because locals have established a claim over preferred schedules or have been promoted to staff positions and are threatened by cosmopolitans from the outside; or, it could arise because cosmopolitans have been promoted from the outside to staff positions, or perhaps given favored schedules in order to attract them.

Again, at least some of the conflict rates associated with heterogeneity and turnover can be explained in terms of differences in status orientations. For example, the heterogeneity ratio is positively associated with the amount of variance in the professional orientation scores ($r_s = +.82$); and there is a nearly perfect correlation between the heterogeneity ratio and the proportion of the staff that is simultaneously high in professional and low in employee orientation (Table 6-8). Also, the local-cosmopolitan ratio is positively associated with the proportion of the staff that is low in professional and high in employee orientation ($r_s = +.86$); and that, in turn, tends to be positively associated with the mean number of years the faculty has been in the school ($r_s = +.66$), although the probability that this correlation is statistically significant is below the five per cent level. In other words, the association between heterogeneity and the proportion of conflicts that are intense may be partly explained in terms of the variability in the way a faculty organizes its professional orientations.

Rates of Conflict and Financial Support

There is evidence that the amount of financial support available to a school is inversely associated with rates of conflict

Table 6-8

RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS BETWEEN STATUS ORIENTATIONS AND
INDICATORS OF HETEROGENEITY AND STAFF EXPANSION AND TURNOVER (N = 7)

| Heterogeneity Index
and
Staff Expansion and Turnover Rates | Variance of Professional Scores | Variance of Employee Scores | Proportion Simultaneously
High Professional-Low Employee | Proportion Simultaneously
Low Professional-High Employee |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|---|
| Total Number of Teachers Added to Staff
Since 1958 | +.54 | +.28 | +.24 | -.04 |
| Number of Years the Faculty Has Been
in the School | +.21 | +.43 | +.14 | +.68 |
| Heterogeneity Ratio--Total | +.82* | -.39 | +1.00** | +.36 |
| Local-Cosmopolitan Ratio--Subtotal | +.36 | +.25 | +.39 | +.86* |

*Significant at $P > .05$, ($P_{.05} = .714$), $N = 7$.

**Significant at $P > .01$, ($P_{.01} = .893$), $N = 7$.

(Table 6-9). For example, for six schools on which information was readily available, the rank order correlation between the number of open or heated discussions or major incidents per interview and the tax rate (as based on the tax evaluation per pupil in average daily attendance) is $r_s = -.91$, and the rank order correlation between that indicator of financial support and the number of open or heated discussions or major incidents per interview involving teachers and administrators is $r_s = -.87$. Similarly, the total tax rate for the system is negatively correlated with the number of open or heated discussions or major incidents per interview ($r_s = -.89$), and the proportion of incidents involving policy and philosophy ($r_s = -.89$). Also, the proportion of all conflicts involving the teacher's authority in the school and over the classroom and curriculum is inversely associated with the proportion of the school's total receipts that comes from federal grants ($r_s = -.77$), although that correlation does not reach statistical significance. It is interesting, on the other hand, that the proportion of conflicts between line and staff appears to increase with the tax evaluation per pupil in average daily attendance, although the correlation is not statistically significant at the five per cent level ($r_s = +.80$).

This pattern of association points to the importance of considering the total context in which a school operates when attempting to explain how patterns of bureaucratization and status orientation influence rates of conflict. It appears that if there are ample economic resources available, some of the rates of conflict tend to diminish; but it is quite possible that other types of conflict might increase, particularly since wealthier districts are able to afford more specialized personnel, whose existence may create other kinds of internal co-ordination problems.

Table 6-9

RANK ORDER CORRELATION BETWEEN TYPES AND RATES OF
CONFLICT AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT (N = 6)

| Indicator of
Financial Support | Rate of Conflict | | | | Type of Conflict | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| | Per Cent of Incidents Between
Line and Staff | Number of Incidents Per Interview | Number of Open or Heated Discussions or Major Incidents Per Interview | Number of Open or Heated Discussions or Major Incidents Per Interview Involving Teachers and Admin. | Proportion of Incidents Involving Student Discipline | Proportion of Incidents Involving Value Conflicts | Proportion of Incidents Involving Authority over School, Classroom, and Curriculum | Proportion of Incidents Involving Scheduling Conflicts | Proportion of Incidents Involving Policy or Philosophy |
| Federal Grants--
Per Cent of Total Receipts ^a | + .45 | -.29 | -.43 | -.46 | -.14 | + .14 | -.77* | + .64 | + .22 |
| Tax Rate--
Tax Valuation Per Pupil According To Average Daily Attendance ^a | + .80 | -.54 | -.91* | -.87* | + .09 | -.60 | -.26 | + .31 | -.14 |
| Total Tax Rate ^a | -.23 | -.71 | -.89* | -.67 | + .09 | -.54 | + .09 | + .37 | -.89* |

^aData available on six schools only .

*Significant at $P > .05$ ($P_{.05} = .829$), $N = 6$

**Significant at $P > .01$ ($P_{.01} = .943$), $N = 6$

Mean Job Satisfaction

The mean level of satisfaction of the faculty with their jobs was computed for each school, using the measure of satisfaction with the job that was described in the preceding chapter. The mean professional conception is positively associated with the mean job satisfaction of the faculty. The rank order correlation is $r_s = +.84$ (Table 6-10). However, the employee climate of the school does not appear to be significantly related to satisfaction with the job.

Table 6-10

RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTIONS OF A FACULTY AND STATUS ORIENTATIONS AND RATES OF CONFLICT

| Measures of Status Orientation and Conflict Rate | Mean Job Satisfaction |
|---|-----------------------|
| Mean Professional Scale Score | +.84* |
| Mean Employee Scale Score | +.46 |
| Number of Conflicts Per Interview | +.90* |
| Number of Open or Heated Discussions or
Major Incidents Per Interview | +.74* |
| Number of Open or Heated Discussions or Major
Incidents Per Interview Involving Teachers
and Administrators | +.68 |
| Proportion of Conflicts Involving Student
Discipline | -.28 |
| Proportion of Conflicts Involving Values | +.74* |
| Proportion of Conflicts Involving the Teacher's
Authority Over the School, Classroom and
Curriculum | -.53 |
| Proportion of Conflicts Involving Scheduling | -.23 |
| Proportion of Conflicts Involving Policy or
Philosophy | +.56 |

*Significant at $P > .05$ ($P_{.05} = 714$); significant at $P > .01$ ($P_{.01} = 893$), $N = 7$.

The high positive correlation between the number of conflicts per interview and the mean level of job satisfaction among the faculty in a school is ($r_s = +.90$) is a most intriguing finding which supports one of the initial hypothesis. There is also a positive rank order correlation ($r_s = +.74$) between the mean level of job satisfaction among the faculty of a school and the rate of conflict involving open or heated discussions or major incidents ($r_s = +.74$). Similarly, there is a positive rank order correlation between job satisfaction and the rate of open, heated discussions or major incidents per interview involving teachers and administrators, but it does not quite reach the five per cent level of significance ($r_s = +.68$).

In contrast to popular assumptions, existence in a conflict-ridden environment does not necessarily lower group satisfaction. On the contrary, conflict can create a satisfying environment, perhaps because participants feel that what they are fighting about is important and will improve the state of their vocation or the welfare of their clients.*

The fact that there is a positive rank order correlation between a faculty's mean satisfaction and the proportion of incidents that involve values suggests that situations where principles are at issue may be somewhat more satisfying than more minor or trivial types of conflicts, over scheduling, for example.

INDIVIDUAL ORIENTATIONS

Initiative and Compliance and Professionalism

Blau has demonstrated that in some cases the group value and the

*Since none of the schools in the study exemplify what might be considered an extremely high rate of conflict, the possibility remains that an extremely conflict-ridden situation is dissatisfying.

individual's orientation has opposite effects on an individual's conduct.* Therefore, it is advisable to consider the relationship between professionalism and militancy from the standpoint of individuals as well as from the organization's standpoint.

Teachers who express tendencies toward different degrees of initiative and compliance have different professional and employee status orientations. Although the relationship is not perfect, the mean professional score tends to decline down the hierarchy from the most rebellious to the most submissive teachers (Table 6-11). The rebellious and contrary (combined) have a significantly higher orientation than the realistic and submissive (combined). They also have the highest rates of conflict per person. The analysis of variance for the complete set is significant at $P < .01$.

The gradient of employee orientations among the initiative and compliance typology tends to conform to expectations also. The rebellious types of teachers have the lowest employee orientations in the sample, and the orientations of the submissive teachers are relatively low (although the "realistic" teachers have the lowest scores in the sample). The analysis of variance is significant at $P > .01$. Thus, individuals who express rebellious tendencies have simultaneously higher professional orientations and lower employee orientations than those with submissive orientations, and they have higher rates of conflict (table 11a).

The mean professional deprivation scores also increase between the submissive and the rebellious types of teachers. That is, the rebellious teachers report more discrepancy between the "is" and "should" parts of the scale than any other type ($\bar{X}=47.5$), and submissive teachers report the least discrepancy ($\bar{X}=37.5$). The intermediate types report average deprivation. The pattern for employee orientation tends to be in the opposite direction, but the difference between types is small.

*Blau, Peter M., "Structural Effects," American Sociological Review, Vol. 25 No. 2 (April 1960), pp. 178-192.

Table 6-11

ANALYSES OF VARIANCES IN PROFESSIONAL AND EMPLOYEE CONCEPTION SCALE SCORES
AND THEIR VARIANCES FOR PATTERNS OF INITIATIVE AND COMPLIANCE (N = 239)

| Type of Initiative and Compliance | N | Mean
Professional
Conception * | Mean
Employee
Conception** | Conflict Rates | |
|-----------------------------------|----|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| | | | | Number/
Person | Per Cent
Involved |
| 1. Rebellious | 24 | 58.7 | 87.4 | 1.83 | 0.46 |
| 2. Contrary | 21 | 57.9 | 85.3 | 0.59 | 0.37 |
| 3. Defiant | 47 | 58.3 | 78.4 | 1.44 | 0.68 |
| 4. Cautious | 71 | 56.1 | 83.6 | 0.48 | 0.23 |
| 5. Realistic | 14 | 56.6 | 67.3 | 0.40 | 0.29 |
| 6. Submissive | 45 | 56.5 | 72.8 | 0.32 | 0.22 |

* High score indicates high professional orientation; Rebellious and Contrary (combined) vs. Realistic and Submissive (combined): C.R. = 1.68 (significant at $P > .05$, one tail test).

** High score indicates low employee orientation; analysis of variance = 9.31, significant at $P > .01$.

* - * - * - * - * - * - * - * - * - * - * - * - * - * - * - * - * - * - *

Table 6-11a

ORGANIZATION OF STATUS CONCEPTIONS AND RATES OF CONFLICT

| Status Organization | N | No. of Conflicts
Per Person | Per Cent Involved | |
|---------------------------------------|----|--------------------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| | | | 1 or more | 2 or more |
| High Professional --
High Employee | 67 | 0.61 | .34 | .16 |
| High Professional --
Low Employee | 60 | 1.27 | .47 | .28 |
| Low Professional --
High Employee | 59 | 0.56 | .29 | .14 |
| Low Professional --
Low Employee | 71 | 0.89 | .31 | .17 |

Chapter 7

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The major objective of this project has been to develop the instrumentation and measurement procedures in preparation for a larger study of the conflicts that occur among professional educators employed in public bureaucracies of varying size and complexity. Two types of conflict have been investigated: (1) friction incidents that have recently occurred among teachers and their administrators, as these have been described by a sample of teachers, and (2) conflicting conceptions of teachers' professional and employee roles, as measured by Likert-type status orientation scales. The general thesis is that professionalization is a militant process by which a vocation attempts to gain control over its work. This militancy is likely to be particularly evident in bureaucratic systems where work is regulated by centralized decision-making authorities, standardized rules and procedures, and specialized personnel.

Two current changes in public school teaching make the problem of professional-employee role conflicts and other status anxieties especially relevant there. On the one hand, school systems are growing more complex, increasing the problems of internal coordination. This, in turn, creates a greater need to standardize work, and to centralize the major decisions and other regulations over work; these developments tend to reinforce the traditional image of the teacher as an employee. On the other hand, teachers are professionalizing, developing professional self-conceptions which include competence and license to control their work. These dual perspectives divide teachers from administrators and among themselves.

It is expected that friction incidents and role conflicts are associated with (a) differences in the positions of personnel within

the organization, (b) differences in their backgrounds, and (c) the degree of bureaucratization in the organization -- i.e., centralization of authority, specialization, and standardization of work. The hypotheses are based on a neglected but growing body of literature describing tensions within organizational structure and role conflicts in relation to organizational structure. There is evidence that certain structural features create tensions, and that the size and complexity of organizations are particularly relevant factors. The organizational tensions tend to involve problems of specialization, allocation of resources, the incorporation of "latent roles" of the labor force arising from different backgrounds of personnel, a dual basis of authority based on technical competence on the one hand, and sheer encumbrance of office on the other, inter-generational conflicts, differentials between the amount of authority and actual autonomy of certain positions, and cleavages between locals and cosmopolitans. Organizational size is an obviously relevant factor, but there is by no means a perfect correlation between size and bureaucratization or other organizational problems.

There is reason to believe that the conditions which create conflict between individuals are somewhat different from those which are responsible for conflicts between groups and representatives of groups. The structural types of problems that create conflicts include the past experience of the parties involved, the complexity of the situation, correspondence of aspiration levels to actuality, the interdependence of units, differences in group goals, recruiting patterns, similarities and differences in experience, rates of interaction, the commitments and involvements of personnel, and problems that stem from subordination, such as those concerning the division of labor, turnover and heterogeneity of personnel, and line and staff relations.

Given the apparent pervasiveness of organizational conflict and the variety of organizational tensions that presumably produce it, a model that incorporates conflict as a central organizational process is needed -- one by which the conditions which prohibit conflict, as well as those that create it, can be examined.

A recent accumulation of literature deals specifically with the role conflicts of professional employees in a variety of settings. The model that has been advocated for the purposes of this research visualizes the status of the professional-employee as the product of a set of contrasting professional and bureaucratic principles which provide independent and sometimes conflicting demands. The conceptual model utilized permits a portrayal of dynamic interaction and suggests a refined differentiation of types of role conflict and role typologies. Specifically, the model of professional-employee role conflict that has been outlined visualizes professional and employee roles as separate variables. The component variables of each concept appear to be applicable to public school systems.

METHODOLOGY

For the preliminary investigation, a sample of seven public high schools located in Ohio and Michigan has been selected to represent a broad range in staff sizes. Since the sample does not represent a random selection of the region, generalizations must be confined to the patterns of association among the variables. The respondent sample is somewhat biased toward older teachers, although in many other respects it is very similar to the Ohio and National norms of teacher characteristics. An average of approximately five days was spent in each of the seven schools administering a seven part questionnaire and interviewing a random sample of the faculty.

Slightly more than a fourth of the 426 teachers on the school faculties were interviewed and two-thirds of them returned questionnaires.

Scales

Several instruments have been developed from analyses of the questionnaire and interview materials. A sixteen item professional orientation scale and a twenty-nine item employee orientation scale have been developed. The items have been selected from among those judged by a panel of sociologists to be relevant to several dimensions of each concept, referred to here as "subscales."* Using critical ratio tests and scale value difference ratios, the final set of items have proved to be internally consistent, in the sense that they discriminate between groups of respondents whose total scale scores are in the extreme quartiles. The items with the largest scale value differences and difference ratios (most of them .5 or above) have been retained. The split half reliability of the employee scale is $r = .74$, or $r_n = .99$ when the Spearman-Brown Prophecy formula is applied; the internal reliability of the shorter professional scale is $r = .48$, which exceeds $r_n = .99$, when corrected.** Each of the major scales also discriminates between respondents who exemplify what can logically be considered extremes of professional and extremes of employee conduct: in the case of high and low professional groups, a combination of high and low levels of education, time devoted to reading journals and number of journals subscribed to, number of articles published, and professional activities; in the case of high and low

*Employee Orientation "Subscales": Administrative orientation, loyalty to the organization, competence based on experience, interchangeability of personnel and standardization of work, stress on rules and procedure, and public orientation.

Professional Orientation "Subscales": Client orientation, orientation to the profession and professional colleagues, competence based on monopoly of knowledge, decision-making authority and control over work.

**Several sets of the items constitute reasonably reliable subscales -- e.g., administrative orientation, loyalty to the organization, and public orientation.

employee groups, a combination of loyalty to the administration as rated by principals, expression of agreements and disagreement with criticisms toward the organization and the administration, and absenteeism. Also, a group of university high school teachers who are technically members of the university faculty, and whose professional orientation is reputedly high, scored at the expected extreme of each scale. The employee scale differentiates among the means of the set of schools in the sample, and the professional scale differentiates between the means of the schools at each extreme.

The total scale scores of the sample are not significantly correlated, which bears out the conceptual model visualizing professional and employee expectations as part of independent systems. Therefore, analysis of the way respondents organize their professional and employee conceptions is of promising importance for studying role conflicts. There is a significant difference in the proportion of the faculties at each school who are simultaneously highly committed to both conceptions, simultaneously low on both, or simultaneously high on one and low on the other.

The scales are also constructed so that it is possible to compute differences between the normative commitment of a faculty to them, and the faculty's perceptions of the extent to which each role is actually fulfilled in practice.

Another scale has been developed to estimate the "initiative" and "compliance" of teachers. It consists of a series of twelve hypothetical "incidents," or situations in which a teacher is opposed to the administration. Respondents are asked to imagine themselves in the situation and to indicate (1) what they would do in the situation, and (2) the perceived sanctions for failing to comply with the administration's request. Six alternatives are possible on the first part, which

range from compliance to quitting the job; the six alternatives in the second part range from mild disapproval from the principal to dismissal. The total respondent scores to each part of twelve situations are internally consistent, using critical ratio and scale value difference methods of analysis. The split-half reliability of the two parts is $r = .74$ and $r = .78$, respectively, which are both above $r_n = .99$ when corrected.

A typology of "initiative" and "compliance" has been established by comparing respondents' total scores on each part. Anticipated actions have been divided into three types -- "initiative," "discretion," and "compliance." Each of these types is again divided into either "severe" or "moderate" constraint on the basis of responses to the second question. The six types of potential behavior patterns are: "rebellious," "contrary," "defiant," "cautious," "realistic," and "submissive."

Only a small portion of the sample are rebellious and only one in five teachers is either rebellious or contrary. On the other hand, one in four teachers would comply; and one in five would comply without the threat of external sanctions. This pattern of response tends to bear out the charges that teachers are submissive and hardly predisposed to militancy. Yet, the significance of the fact that one in ten teachers is rebellious cannot be ignored; it is typically a small minority which spearheads militant movements. The majority of teachers would use only a discreet form of opposition, and again, more are cautious in this respect than are defiant. Only six per cent of the sample show an "unrealistic" tendency to comply in the face of severe sanctions. This seems to indicate that if teachers are conformists they are so because they want to be and not entirely because of the threat of external sanctions.

Other Indices of Respondent Characteristics

In addition to these scales, indices have been developed to assess the local and cosmopolitan behavior and orientations of respondents. Five indices of "local" and "cosmopolitan" behavior patterns have been considered: number of years in the system, whether or not there has been previous residence in the county where the teacher is now employed, whether or not he has held an office in a local community organization, the number of systems in which he has taught, and whether or not he crossed state lines to attend college. The proportion of these five indices on which a respondent scored as a local or as a cosmopolitan is the index of his local-cosmopolitan behavior. Local-Cosmopolitan orientation has been estimated on the basis of the reference group that teachers say would guide them in making up their mind in a controversy about whether or not to build a new school for the mentally gifted children in the system. The schools' ranks on local orientation and behavior are correlated, but cosmopolitan orientation and behavior is not significantly correlated for the schools..

The Vocational commitment of teachers has been inferred from responses to the question, "What do you plan to be doing two years from now?" The proportion of the sample who plan to remain in the same school is similar to that found in other studies. Satisfaction with the vocation of teaching has been measured with two inter-correlated sets of items.

Structural Characteristics

The extent to which decision-making in a school is centralized has been estimated principally from respondents' perceptions of who actually makes specific types of decisions. The alternatives, which range from the individual teachers involved to school board members and the State Department of Education, have been weighted (from one to six) in order of increasing centralization. Two types of decisions

have been included: those that are relevant to professional authority and those that are not necessarily relevant to professional authority; this distinction is based on the beliefs of the most professionally oriented teachers in the sample. The product between the weight of each response and the number of respondents who identify each level of authority has been obtained on each part of the instrument for each school. The ranks of the schools on each of the two parts of the instruments are similar, but the correlation does not reach statistical significance.

The rank order correlation between the "decision-making authority" subscale of the professional orientation scale and the non-professionally relevant items of the decision-making instrument ($r_s = +.92$) shows that the global measure of centralization provides conclusions comparable to those based on that part of the decision-making instrument. However, the correlation between the "decision-making" subscale and the professionally relevant types of decisions on the instrument does not reach statistical significance ($r_s = +.62$). This lower correlation can probably be explained by the fact that the decisions included in the decision-making subscale are not explicitly limited to the classroom, in contrast to the professionally relevant part of the instrument.

Standardization of work has been estimated by utilizing two descriptive subscales of the professional and employee orientation subscales. One of these subscales pertains to the specificity and enforcement of rules and procedures in the school and in the classroom; the other subscale assesses the emphasis that a school places on standard lesson plans and the interchangeability of personnel throughout the school and the school system. The rules and procedures measure was considered separately and in conjunction with the other measure. The rank order correlation between the schools on the two types of measures

shows only a low positive correlation ($r_s = +.49$), which is too low to be statistically significant. However, the rules and procedures subscale is positively and significantly correlated with all three measures of centralization noted above. Such an association between decentralization and standardization seems reasonable in view of the fact that centralized decisions are usually implemented in terms of rules and procedures.

An index of the heterogeneity of the backgrounds of the faculties has been constructed by dicotomizing their relevant background characteristics and computing the ratio for each school -- e.g., the ratio of personnel in the school under thirty and those over forty-five years of age, etc. The size of schools may be positively associated with heterogeneity, but the correlation is too low to be statistically significant in this sample.

The autonomy of departments, or subject matter areas within the schools, has been computed on the basis of teachers' estimates of how frequently they have consulted with a member of the administration during the year. Generally, language, mathematics, and athletic departments report more autonomy from the administration than do other departments, while "non-academic" (e.g., music and art), home economics and English departments have the least autonomy. The prestige of each subject matter area has also been estimated by asking teachers to assume that budget limitations have made it necessary to eliminate three courses from the present curriculum, and to indicate the ones which they think should be the first to be eliminated and those which should be eliminated last. The rank of each course was determined on the basis of the difference between the proportion of the faculty mentioning it as last and the proportion mentioning it as the first to be eliminated. Generally speaking, the academic subjects

claim more prestige, especially English, math, and science. At the other extreme, the applied, vocational, and non academic courses rank low. It is probably significant that the correlation between prestige and autonomy for the total sample combined is not statistically significant. It might be speculated that the amount of discrepancy between a department's prestige and its autonomy is an important contributor to the incidence of conflict.

Informal leadership in the schools has been assessed by a combination of criteria. Respondents were asked to recall three teachers in their school whose ideas and opinions seem to have gotten the most support from other teachers over the past year. They were also asked to name the teachers with whom they have consulted most frequently since the beginning of the school year for advice about a problem that has come up in connection with their classroom teaching. Considering only the teachers mentioned at least once on either index, there is a low linear correlation of $r = +.40$ between the frequency of mention on the two measures. One or the other of the two measures, in turn, identified over two-thirds of the ninety-one members of the sample who had held offices in unions or professional or community organizations. It is concluded that persons who qualify on all three of these criteria may be safely considered to be informal leaders.

Teachers also were asked to name three teachers in their school whose ideas about education they respect the most. The correlation between this measure and the number of nominations for having received the most support from other teachers (for those who were mentioned at least once on either measure) is $r = +.50$. Since only one quarter of the variance in the degree to which teachers are highly esteemed is accounted for by their informal leadership status, this rating of esteem will be considered as an independent measure. Comparing teachers' ratings on this measure of esteem with the way they are

rated using a more systematic procedure (wherein, each respondent is rated by every other), one-third of those in the sample were identified identically in the upper quartile of esteem on both measures. The simple measure is perhaps a reasonably accurate way of identifying a small proportion of the teachers who are the most highly respected, although it is not effective for rank ordering the complete range of teachers.

The instrument that will be used to assess the sociometric structures of schools asks respondents to indicate on a five point scale, ranging from "very often" to "not at all," how frequently they associate with each of the other teachers in the school at coffee breaks, at lunch, and socially outside of school hours. When the choice of their three best friends was compared with the frequency of association with others socially outside of school hours, only slightly more than a quarter of the sample was classified in the upper quartile of popularity identically on both measures. It appears that popularity rated by feelings of friendship is not closely related with the actual patterns of interaction, which are deemed to be a more important part of the settings in which interpersonal disputes occur.

FINDINGS

Analysis of Reported Conflicts

Teachers were asked to describe "friction incidents," or disputes involving themselves and other members of the faculty. A total of 326 separate "incidents" have been identified from 146 tape recorded interviews. Of the total, approximately half involved one or more open or heated discussions with another party or a "major incident" -- i.e., one which eventually involved more than the original two parties. The other types of "incidents" involve general complaints, complaints directed against specific parties, or impersonal forms of competition.

The content of each incident has been analyzed and classified in several ways, among them the type of issue involved, the intensity of the incident, the role partners involved, and the reaction of the parties involved. During short forty-minute interviews, there was little opportunity to systematically attempt to corroborate the reports; consequently, very few of them have been corroborated, in the sense that two or more respondents have described the same particulars. However, there is consensus within schools on the frequency with which different types of problems have created incidents. Moreover, many of the incidents which were not directly corroborated were mentioned by "reliable" respondents who did report at least one corroborated incident; nearly half of the incidents are either corroborated or reported by reliable respondents. The frequency with which validated, reliable, and non-validated types of incidents were mentioned is not significantly different, as tested by chi square.

It was found that the number of conflicts that were reported in a school increases directly with the number of the staff interviewed, but it is not related to either the size of the school staff or to the proportion of the staff interviewed. In order to avoid a measure of the conflict rate which is a function of the number of interviews, the index of organization conflict rates that was used is the number of incidents reported per interview.

This method of computing the rate of conflict has been compared to a "global tension" measure based on a question which asks "how much tension" exists between each of thirteen types of role partners in each school (e.g., teacher-administrative role, teacher-teacher role, etc.) The alternatives range from severe to none. There is a direct Spearman rank order correlation between the total number of incidents reported per interview and this global measure of tension ($r_s = +.82$).

The rank order correlation between this global measure and the rate of open or heated discussions or major incidents reported per interview is even higher ($r_s = .93$). Also, the respondents were asked to indicate how much tension exists between them and every other member of the faculty. When schools are ranked only on the basis of the proportion of faculty mentioning "severe" tension, the rank order correlation with the number of open or heated discussions or major incidents per interview is $r_s = +.86$; and, with rate of open or heated discussions or major incidents per interview that specifically involve teachers and administrators it is $r_s = +.89$.

The rates of conflict computed from interviews also correlate with other independent measures of conflict, such as the frequency with which respondents report that their contacts with the principal have involved disputes, with the proportion of teachers checking at least one negative statement about the principal, and with the proportion of teachers who mentioned that compliance most impresses the principal.

The questionnaire and interview methods of computing conflict rates provide similar conclusions; and to that extent credence can be given to the estimates of conflict rates based on the interview reports. However, it has not been possible to accurately classify either the content of the issues involved or their intensity from the brief descriptions of incidents in the questionnaires. Therefore, even though reliable estimates of the rates of conflict can be obtained from questionnaire materials alone, interviews appear to be essential to implement the objectives of this type of study.

Evidence of Professional Militancy

The weight of evidence tends to support the general thesis that professionalization is a militant process which contributes to rates of organizational conflict. With respect to the various indicators of the professional climate, the conclusions are not entirely consistent,

perhaps because a number of characteristics that are commonly assumed to be associated with professionalism are not themselves associated. For example, while there is a significant positive correlation between schools when ranked on the basis of their mean professional score and the proportion of the faculty expressing the need for more academic freedom for students, mean professional scale scores are not associated with the proportion of teachers expressing a need for more academic freedom for teachers; although, the proportion of the faculty simultaneously high in professional and low in employee orientation is positively correlated with the prevalence of that belief. The contrast in these two findings illustrates the importance of considering configurations of professional employee orientations within organizations. It is not only necessary to understand what a faculty is for, but to ascertain what it is against. In this case, it is not the degree of professionalism itself that is of most significance, but whether or not that professionalism is accompanied by a negative orientation toward the employee status. However, the literature on role conception has tended to neglect this kind of interplay between contrasting value systems.

The mean professional scale score is inversely associated with the proportion of a faculty feeling that knowledge of subject matter should be the most emphasized goal, but it is positively associated with the proportion feeling that character training should be most emphasized. Mean employee scores are positively associated with the proportion of a faculty holding office in a community organization. Curiously, the proportion of a staff that is active in professional associations tends to be inversely associated with the mean professional score of a faculty (although it is not statistically significant), and the proportion active in unions is positively associated with the proportion of the faculty simultaneously high in professional and low in employee orientation. This may mean that teachers who are professionally

militant are joining the labor union movement, which has a history of militancy. The positive association between the proportion of the teachers simultaneously low in professional and high in employee orientation and dropout rate suggests that the status orientation of a faculty is associated with the organization's quality and productivity.

Some of these characteristics which determine the professional climate are positively associated with rates of conflict, which suggests that, in several respects, professionalism is militant. For example, the proportion of the faculty expressing a need for more academic freedom for students is positively associated with the gross rate of the more intense conflicts, while there is an inverse relationship between the proportion of the faculty who have published professional articles and rates of conflict. But, if the professional climate is assumed to be associated with rates of conflict, it also seems to be true that teaching professions themselves are not particularly militant; in fact, there is an inverse relation between the proportion of a staff that is active in professional associations and some rates of conflict. The same tends to be true of unions, although there is a positive association between the proportion of a faculty who are active in unions and the proportion of all conflicts in a school that involve open or heated discussions or major incidents. In that respect, the organized character of unions may tend to reduce the number of conflicts, but aggravate the intensity of those that do occur. It also seems that certain rates of conflict are associated with the goals that are emphasized in a school. For example, emphasis on knowledge of subject matter tends to be inversely associated with rates of conflict, while emphasis on character training and getting along with others tends to be positively associated with rates of conflict.

The suspicion that conflict rates are higher in professional climates is borne out more consistently when rates of conflict are compared with levels of status orientation in the schools. The two schools with the highest level of professional orientation have a gross rate of conflict that is higher than the mean for all schools, and the rate of open or heated discussions or major incidents per interview is several times higher for the two most professional schools than for the two schools that have the lowest professional orientations. Furthermore, there is a significant rank order correlation between the mean professional scale scores of the schools and the gross rate of conflict, the rate of intense conflict, and the rate of intense conflict between teachers and the administration.

The same conclusions tend to be supported by the rank order comparisons of the mean professional scale scores within a school and independent indicators of conflict and compliance based on questionnaire responses. The mean professional scale scores are positively associated with the proportion of teachers reporting that contacts with the principal or assistant principal and with parents have involved disputes; the correlation with the proportion of teachers checking at least one negative statement about the principal also approaches significance at the five per cent level. Conversely, the proportion of teachers who mentioned that compliance most impresses the principal is inversely associated with the mean professional score of the school.

Thus, status orientation appears to be an important characteristic of the overall school "climate" which noticeably affects rates of organizational conflict. On the other hand, the reverse is not true -- the rate of conflict does not diminish with higher employee orientation, which in most cases is not significantly associated with conflict rates. This may imply that conflict cannot be reduced simply by winning the

loyalty of employees. The rate of conflict can be more effectively minimized by denying an opportunity for professional conceptions to be expressed by emphasizing compliance. In this sense, professional status orientations of the faculty may be the price of organizational peace.

There is little evidence, at this point, that conflict is a particularly dissatisfying experience. On the contrary, the rank order correlation among the schools between the mean job satisfaction of teachers and rates of certain types of conflict is positive. Whether or not morale is adversely affected by rates of conflict may depend more on the type of issue that is fought over than on the overall conflict rate.

Bureaucracy and Conflict

If rates of conflict are associated with professional orientation, it is also true that they tend to be associated with certain structural characteristics of organization. There tends to be a positive rank order correlation between average class size and the various rates of conflict, and there is a positive correlation between the proportion of conflicts over policy and philosophy and the amount of emphasis on rules and procedures within a school. There also seems to be an inverse relationship between the amount of specialization that a school has achieved (as measured by the number of part time teachers, and by the proportion of teachers who are teaching courses in which they have neither majored or minored), and the overall rate of conflict, particularly the more intense incidents. Centralization, as measured in terms of the scales employed in this study, is also associated with certain aspects of conflict. The centralization of non professional types of decisions is positively associated with the number of open or heated discussions or major incidents per interview involving

teachers and the administration, and with the proportion of all incidents in a school involving student discipline and value conflicts. On the other hand, the centralization of professional decisions does not seem to be associated with gross rates of conflict and there is an unexplained inverse correlation between the centralization of professional types of decisions and the proportion of conflicts involving student discipline.

The size of a school does not appear to have any consistent or significant influence on the rate of conflict. However, in contrast to size, the total number of teachers added to the staff in the past five years is associated with the rate of intense conflicts between teachers and the administration and it tends to be associated with the proportion of conflicts between the line and staff. On the other hand, the longer a faculty has been in a school, the lower is the rate of more intense types of conflict. The overall heterogeneity ratio of a school is associated with the proportion of conflicts that involve open or heated discussions or major incidents, while the ratio of local to cosmopolitan teachers in a school is positively associated with the proportion of conflicts between the line and staff and proportion involving scheduling.

Finally, the amount of economic support available to a school appears to be associated with certain rates of conflict. It appears that if there are ample economic resources available, some of the rates of conflict tend to diminish; but it is quite possible that other types of conflict tend to increase, particularly since wealthier districts are able to employ more specialized personnel, thus creating internal coordination problems. It appears that the total context in which the school operates does need to be taken into account in explaining some of the patterns of conflict.

Turning from the organizational climate to the particular characteristics of the individuals involved, the mean professional score of teachers tends to decline down the hierarchy from the most rebellious teacher to the most submissive as classified on the basis of the initiative and compliance scale. The most rebellious teachers have the highest professional conceptions and the lowest employee conceptions, while the reverse is true for submissive teachers. Deprivation of professional orientation shows a similar pattern.

Implications

It would be premature to dwell on the implications of this preliminary analysis. Rather, the implications point to the need for further research based on a larger sample and more systematic analyses. It seems significant that a small sample has so consistently demonstrated some of the major assumptions behind the research project. More important, the weight of evidence has seemed to demonstrate that the instruments constructed for this study do work, at least insofar as the measures based on them have often supported the general thesis.

Time and again the study seems to have pointed the need for a larger sample on which more systematic and refined analyses can be performed. For example, the present sample is not large enough to explore the consequences of various combinations of status orientations and bureaucratic characteristics, or of these combinations in different economic contexts. The feasibility of exploring these types of questions more systematically appears to have been demonstrated by this project.

APPENDIX I
FORM LETTERS

Appendix Ia
LETTER OF INVITATION

March 12, 1963

Mr. _____
Superintendent of Public Schools
40 West Street
_____, Ohio

Dear Sir:

A school in your system is being invited to participate in a study of public schools in the midwest being conducted by the Department of Sociology at The Ohio State University. This study is being financed by the United States Office of Education and The Ohio State University. Principally because of its size and location, _____ High School has been selected as one of the several schools which will be invited to participate in the study. At this time, we are soliciting both your permission to include the above high school this spring, and your official support of the objectives of the study, which are outlined below.

This is a study of the problems that public school teachers in various types of schools face today. The focus of the study is on organization, and is theoretical rather than immediately practical; although, it is expected that the findings will have practical implications for educational leaders, such as yourself.

Specifically, we are seeking to extend to the public schools a sociological theory of the effects of complex organizations on behavior. The questions being raised include: What influence does the size of the school, the division of labor, and the backgrounds and friendship patterns of teachers have on the kinds of problems that arise among teachers and between teachers and school administrators?

This study has received the endorsement of The Ohio School Boards Association.

If you agree to participate, a member of the research staff will spend a week at the school sometime between April 15th and May 31st. At that time, teachers will be asked to complete a series of questionnaires, which take approximately three hours to complete. In addition, during the week, a sample of teachers in the school will be interviewed.

Page 2

Mr. _____

March 12, 1963

The responses will remain completely confidential, of course. They will be seen only by professional sociologists. Your school will remain unidentified in all published material. Your school system will receive a copy of the preliminary findings.

For your convenience, a brief questionnaire is enclosed to inform us of your decision. Please return it within five days.

Your cooperation is important for the success of the study, and it will be deeply appreciated. We take the liberty to thank you in advance, in anticipation of your interest and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Ronald G. Corwin, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor and
Principal Investigator

RGC: lw
Encs.

Appendix I-b

SAMPLE OF THE ENCLOSURE

Dear Professor Corwin:

- ☐ The school which you mentioned in your letter is very interested in participating in the research project and will give its full support and cooperation.

In future correspondence, write directly to:

- ☐ The school which you mentioned in your letter is interested in participating in the research project, but would like more information. Specific questions are included in a letter which follows.

- ☐ The school which you mentioned in your letter is interested in participating, but it can participate only during the week of _____.

- ☐ The school which you mentioned in your letter is not interested in participating in the research project at this time.

Sincerely,

Comments: _____

Appendix I-c

LETTER TO RESPONDENTS IN THE STUDY, WHICH ACCOMPANIED QUESTIONNAIRE

March 12, 1963

Dear Educator:

We need your help. This is a survey of the place that contemporary teachers have in various types of public schools in the country, and of the problems which they face. Some of these problems may be unique to your school or to the people in it, but our assumption is that many of your problems are shared by other teachers elsewhere and are not entirely due to individuals who happen to be at your school. To test this assumption, we are asking for your opinions on some specific questions about the problems which you might face as a public school teacher, your relationship to your colleagues, and your views on the teacher's role.

This survey is being conducted by the Department of Sociology at The Ohio State University, and it is being financed by the U.S. Office of Education. The study has the endorsement of your administration and of the Ohio School Boards Association.

However, the study is being conducted solely by sociologists at the Ohio State University, who assume complete responsibility for the study's design, execution, and analysis. The information which you provide will be used solely for the purpose of developing a scientific theory of schools as organizations. While the study may have some practical implications for the organization of public schools, no specific recommendation will be made pertaining to your particular school. As a participant in the study, your questionnaire will be assigned a code number to assure you complete anonymity. No one but a few professional sociologists at The Ohio State University will have access to your questionnaire. Your responses will be treated in the strictest professional confidence at all times. At no time will your name or the name of your school be identified in published reports.

Therefore, please be completely candid. The accuracy with which you report your opinions and observations is critical for the success of the study and for the kinds of conclusions that are ultimately derived from it.

Your time and thought on this study will be of a significant value to public education and may contribute to the clarification of the role of the teacher in the public schools. Thank you sincerely for the thoughtful attention and assistance which you are about to give.

Gratefully yours,

Ronald G. Corwin, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor and
Principal Investigator

THE TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE, IN SEVEN PARTS (Revised)

Appendix IIa

Code Number _____ PERSONAL INFORMATION (Part I)

The information in this questionnaire will be used solely for scientific purposes. Only professional sociologists at The Ohio State University will see your answers, which will remain strictly confidential at all times. Your complete cooperation is essential to the study and is greatly appreciated.

In this part of the questionnaire, you are being asked to supply information about your personal background.

1. Your name _____ (to be used only for coding purposes)
2. The school where you are now employed _____
 - a. Your position (i.e., classroom teacher, department head, assistant principal, attendance officer, counselor, counselor-teacher, etc.) _____
3. Your sex: ☐ Male ☐ Female
4. Your age at last birthday: _____ years
5. Your marital status: ☐ Single ☐ Married ☐ Separated
☐ Divorced ☐ Widowed
 - a. Do you have children under 18 years old? ☐ No ☐ Yes
6. List the course(s) that you have taught most frequently during the past two years: _____
 - a. Is the course you teach most frequently a required course?
☐ No ☐ Yes
 - b. Do you coach athletics? ☐ No ☐ Yes
 - c. Are you involved in any type of extra-curricular activity? ☐ No
☐ Yes. If so, what is it? _____
7. How many years have you worked in this system (as of this coming June)? _____
 - a. How many years have you worked in this school (as of this coming June)? _____
8. Are you employed full time by the school system? ☐ No ☐ Yes
 - a. Do you presently work in more than one school in the system?
☐ No ☐ Yes
 - b. Does your department have an official Department Head? ☐ No ☐ Yes
9. In how many other school systems have you worked previous to your present position? _____
 - a. In how many different schools in the present system have you worked? _____
 - b. Have you ever been transferred within the present system without your consent? ☐ No ☐ Yes
10. What is your salary for teaching between Sept. and June of this year? _____
 - a. Do you work part time during the year? ☐ No ☐ Yes

- b. Do you plan to seek employment outside the school system this summer?
☐ No ☐ Yes
11. Considering your skill, training and dedication to teaching, what salary do you feel that you should be earning during the present school year? \$ _____
12. Number of years of college completed: (Check one)
☐ less than one year ☐ five
☐ one ☐ six
☐ two ☐ seven
☐ three ☐ more than seven
☐ four
13. The highest college degree which you have completed: (Check one)
☐ B.A. or ☐ B.S. ☐ none
☐ M.A. or ☐ M.S. ☐ 2 year degree
☐ Ph.D. or ☐ D.Ed. ☐ B. Ed.
a. Date awarded: _____
14. College major: _____
a. College minor: _____
15. Name and location of college where highest degree was awarded:

(Name) (City) (State)
16. Type of college where you did most of your undergraduate work: (Check one)
☐ normal school ☐ College of Education (university)
☐ Liberal Arts College ☐ Teachers College
☐ College other than Education or Liberal Arts
a. What is the primary source of financing for the college (above)?
☐ Public ☐ Private
17. Please estimate the total number of semester college credits which you have earned outside of Education: (3 Quarter credits equal 2 Semester credits)

18. What was your total accumulative grade point average in college?
☐ A ☐ B+ ☐ B ☐ C+ ☐ C ☐ D+ ☐ D
19. Have you ever taught a course(s) at this school in which you did not major in college? ☐ No ☐ Yes
20. Have you ever taught a course(s) at this school in which you did not major or minor in college: ☐ No ☐ Yes
a. If so, how many different courses? _____

27. How many professional conferences and workshops have you attended since September 1961? _____

28. Do you subscribe to any professional journals? ☐ No

☐ Yes; how many? _____

a. Estimate how much time have you devoted to reading professional journals each month since last June (on the average) _____ hours per month

29. Have you published any professional articles: ☐ No

☐ Yes; how many? _____

a. Please list below the titles of the major articles (or books) that you have written during your career.

Title

Place Published

| | |
|-------|-------|
| _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |

30. How many days work have you missed since the first day of the school year? _____

31. Have you held an office in any community organization in your present community?

☐ No ☐ Yes

Name of the organization _____

32. Your religious affiliation: _____

33. Please estimate how many hours you have spent in church and on church-related activities since September 1st of this year _____

a. What is/was (underline which) your father's occupation? _____

Briefly describe his duties: _____

34. What is/was your father's estimated annual income as of the last year he was fully employed? \$ _____

Appendix IIb

THE NATURE OF YOUR WORK (PART II)

Code Number _____

In this part of the questionnaire, you are being asked to provide information about the nature of the work you are doing and about some of your general perceptions about it and your associates.

1. Assume that there is a disagreement in the school district about whether to build a new school especially to accomodate the mentally gifted children in the system--

Please rank in importance from 1 to 3 the three individuals or groups which would be most important to you for guidance in making up your own mind.

- ☐ State or National teachers' associations
- ☐ Participants in professional conferences, state conventions, and workshops
- ☐ Teachers whom you respect in your school
- ☐ University professors
- ☐ A particular administrator in the school or system
- ☐ State Department of Education
- ☐ The United States Office of Education
- ☐ Local School board
- ☐ Local parents' groups (e.g., PTA, etc.)

2. How does teaching compare with other types of work?

- ☐ It is the most satisfying career a person could follow
- ☐ It is one of the most satisfying careers
- ☐ It is as satisfying as most careers
- ☐ It is less satisfying than most careers

3. If you "had to do it over again" would you enter the field of teaching?

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☐ Definitely yes | ☐ Probably no |
| ☐ Probably yes | ☐ Definitely no |

4. On the whole, are you satisfied that the school administration accepts you as a professional expert to the degree to which you feel you are entitled by reason of your position, training, and experience?

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Very well satisfied | ☐ Fairly dissatisfied |
| ☐ Fairly well satisfied | ☐ Very dissatisfied |

5. How satisfied are you with your present job when you consider the expectations you had when you took the job?

☐ Very well satisfied ☐ Fairly dissatisfied
☐ Fairly well satisfied ☐ Very dissatisfied

6. Please check the proper statement which best expresses your feeling concerning how satisfied you are with your job when you compare it to other teaching jobs.

☐ Very well satisfied ☐ Fairly dissatisfied
☐ Fairly well satisfied ☐ Very dissatisfied

7. What do you actually anticipate that you will be ~~doing~~ two (2) years from this June? (Please check only one.) I will be:

☐ Teaching in the same school system, same job
☐ Teaching in the same school system, better job
☐ In administration in the same school system
☐ Teaching in a different school system, similar job
☐ Administration in a different school system
☐ Returning to university for more education, and:
 ☐ Will return to teaching
 ☐ Will return to administration
 ☐ Will not return to education
☐ Part time teaching
☐ Not in education at all
 ☐ Leaving the labor force
 ☐ Going into another type of work
☐ Other (Please specify) _____

8. Would you leave your present job for an equivalent or better position? (Check once for each question.)

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| a. at a lower salary? | ☐ No | ☐ Yes |
| b. at the same salary? | ☐ No | ☐ Yes |
| c. at a \$500 year salary increase? / | ☐ No | ☐ Yes |
| d. at a \$1000 year salary increase? | ☐ No | ☐ Yes |
| e. at a \$3000 year salary increase? | ☐ No | ☐ Yes |

9. Please rank the items below from 1 to 5 in the order in which you feel each needs greater emphasis in your school. (1 = most needs greater emphasis
5 = least needs emphasis).
- ___ Increased teachers' salaries
- ___ Promotion of deserving teachers
- ___ Teachers' tenure
- ___ Academic freedom of students
- ___ Academic Freedom of teachers
10. Assume, that, for budgetary reasons, it has become necessary to omit several courses from the present curriculum at this school. Please list in order, three (3) courses that would be the last you would wish to see omitted from the curriculum: 1. _____
2. _____ 3. _____
11. Name three teachers in this school whose ideas about public education you re-
spect the most. (list by code number)
- _____
12. Try to recall three teachers in this school whose ideas and opinions seem to have gotten the most support from the other teachers, within the past year or two, (list by code number)
- _____
13. Do you think that, generally, the administration's evaluations of you have been essentially accurate and fair? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- a. How many times a year do you think you are officially evaluated by the super-
intendent? _____
- b. How many times a year do you think you are officially evaluated by the prin-
cipal? _____
14. Please indicate by checking in the appropriate space on the right-hand margin (a) how frequently you have normally talked to each of the following persons during the past six months. that school was in session, and (b) whether these contacts frequently involved a dispute.

| Type of Person | Not at all | Once a month | Once a week | Once a day | Several times daily | Contacts frequently involved a dispute | |
|---|------------|--------------|-------------|------------|---------------------|--|-----|
| | | | | | | No | Yes |
| One or more school board members | | | | | | | |
| Superintendent of schools | | | | | | | |
| One or more of the superintendent's assistants | | | | | | | |
| The Principal | | | | | | | |
| One or more of the principal's assistants | | | | | | | |
| Your department head | | | | | | | |
| An officer of the PTA | | | | | | | |
| Members of a local civic group | | | | | | | |
| A parents' committee interested in the schools | | | | | | | |
| Business leaders in the community | | | | | | | |
| One or more parents of the children in your classroom | | | | | | | |

15. Of your five best friends (i.e., persons whom you see most frequently socially,) how many of them teach at this school? (List their code numbers here.) _____

a. If any of your five best friends are not teachers, list their occupations below.

16. List the code number of three teachers at this school whom you consider to be your best friends.

17. Indicate whether or not each of these statements listed below accurately describes your principal.

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| ☐ No | ☐ Yes | He asks more than staff members can get done. |
| ☐ No | ☐ Yes | He usually supports members of the faculty |
| ☐ No | ☐ Yes | He refuses to explain his actions |
| ☐ No | ☐ Yes | He acts without consulting his staff |
| ☐ No | ☐ Yes | He treats all staff members as his equals |
| ☐ No | ☐ Yes | He gets staff approval on minor matters before going ahead |
| ☐ No | ☐ Yes | He pushes for higher achievement level on the statewide tests. |
| ☐ No | ☐ Yes | He does not put suggestions made by the staff into operation |
| ☐ No | ☐ Yes | He is one of the most competent educators in the school system |
| ☐ No | ☐ Yes | He does not get staff members' approval on important matters before going ahead |
| ☐ No | ☐ Yes | He is an excellent educational leader |
| ☐ No | ☐ Yes | He presents a problem as a challenge to the staff |
| ☐ No | ☐ Yes | He stresses results rather than methods |
| ☐ No | ☐ Yes | He is usually able to secure what the faculty wants from the higher administration |

18. Please rank in column 1 the following educational goals from 1 to 6 in the order that you think the emphasis should be given to these goals in this school, and rank in column 2 how much emphasis you think is actually given to them (1-6).

| | (1)
Should be given | (2)
Is actually given |
|---|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Critical thinking | _____ | _____ |
| Vocational training | _____ | _____ |
| Knowledge of subject matter | _____ | _____ |
| Character training (moral and religious | _____ | _____ |
| Citizenship | | |
| Learning to get along with others | _____ | _____ |
| Other goals (Specify) _____ | _____ | _____ |

19. From how many people do you directly receive directions or instructions? _____

a. If you receive instructions from more than one person, how frequently do their directions disagree from one another? (Check one)

_____ Very frequently

_____ Frequently

_____ Occasionally

_____ Seldom

_____ Never

20. If teachers were required to have five years of education (rather than four) in order to be employed by the schools in this state, of what do you recommend that the fifth year consist? (Specify type of courses or experience):

21. If a teacher wanted to impress the principal, what could that teacher do that would be (a) most impressive to him? _____
and, (b) least impressive to him? _____

22. Do you believe that your superintendent is too removed from the daily school affairs to actually know what is going on and what the central problems are?

☐ No

☐ Yes

23. Suppose that there is something about the curriculum that you want to change. You go to see the person immediately above you in the hierarchy; he sends you to see the person above him. What is the maximum number of such "levels of authority" (i.e., people above you), that you might have to go through before you reach the superintendent's office? _____

Appendix II-c

INITIATIVE AND COMPLIANCE CRITICAL INCIDENT SCALES^a
("THE WAY I SEE IT", PART III)

Below is a list of incidents which have occurred in different schools throughout the country. We are interested in getting your reactions to these situations. There is no right or wrong answer. Just imagine yourself as the teacher in each situation. Indicate (1) what you would do in each of these situations, and (2) what is likely to happen to you if you do not comply when a situation arises at your school.

| Item | Analysis Results | | |
|---|------------------|------|------|
| | SVD | C.R. | SVDR |
| 1. Because of a shortage of English teachers, a principal requested a history teacher who had neither majored nor minored in English in college to teach English next year. The teacher maintained that he was not competent to teach the English course. . . Imagine yourself as the history teacher: ^b | | | |
| Part A | 1.29 | 4.09 | .29 |
| Part B | 1.87 | 5.44 | .38 |

2. A teacher refused to use a textbook which was in use in the system. She said that it was not challenging enough for her particular students. The principal told her

^aThese items have been included in the final instrument.

^bTwo scales are based on responses to parts A and B for each situation. The following response alternatives pertain to each item:

Part A. What would you do in the situation described above? (Check only one).

- ☐ 1. Comply with superior's request
- ☐ 2. Try to compromise
- ☐ 3. Seek the support of colleagues
- ☐ 4. Ask for an investigation by a professional organization
- ☐ 5. Refuse to comply with the request
- ☐ 6. Quit the job

Part B. What do you anticipate will happen to you if you do not comply with the above request? (Check only one).

- ☐ 1. No disapproval or mild disapproval from the principal
- ☐ 2. Strong disapproval but no formal action from the principal
- ☐ 3. Loss of reputation
- ☐ 4. Loss of deserved promotion or deserved salary increase
- ☐ 5. Transferred to a less desirable position
- ☐ 6. Dismissal from the school system

Part C. Do you think it was right and reasonable for the principal to make such a demand?

☐ Yes

☐ No

that she would have to use the book. . . Imagine yourself as the teacher:

| | | | |
|--------|------|------|-----|
| Part A | .40 | 5.44 | .38 |
| Part B | 2.40 | 7.34 | .47 |

a3. The assistant principal told a teacher that he was too "outspoken" in criticizing certain policies of the school and that this was causing unrest among faculty members, suggesting that he refrain from further outspoken criticism. . . Imagine yourself as the teacher:

| | | | |
|--------|------|-------|-----|
| Part A | 2.00 | 6.24 | .51 |
| Part B | 3.49 | 13.59 | .70 |

4. The principal insisted that a social studies teacher avoid making critical statements about controversial topics, (such as existing racial prejudice, social class differences, and right-wing groups) which, he said, might be misinterpreted by some students and their parents. . . Imagine yourself as the teacher:

| | | | |
|--------|------|-------|-----|
| Part A | 1.64 | 6.13 | .47 |
| Part B | 3.49 | 13.59 | .70 |

5. A teacher was in the habit of leaving the building 30 minutes before the end of the official day after his classroom responsibilities were finished. The principal requested him to remain in the building until the official quitting time . . . Imagine yourself as the teacher:

| | | | |
|--------|------|------|-----|
| Part A | .35 | 2.40 | .53 |
| Part B | 1.98 | 5.95 | .43 |

a6. A mathematics teacher was told by the principal that he was not presenting his subject in the most effective way, and that he should revise his course content and the methods of teaching it. He maintained that his professional society had recommended these procedures. . . Imagine yourself as the teacher:

| | | | |
|--------|------|-------|-----|
| Part A | 2.13 | 8.36 | .58 |
| Part B | 3.38 | 12.78 | .70 |

a7. A teacher planned to invite a well-known author to speak for his class but the principal advised against it because of the speaker's alleged "socialistic leanings". The teacher felt the allegations were unfounded, and that his students would benefit by hearing what he had to say. . . Imagine yourself as the teacher:

| | | | |
|--------|------|-------|-----|
| Part A | 2.06 | 7.16 | .55 |
| Part B | 2.95 | 10.33 | .63 |

8. A teacher's contract stipulated that she must teach in any school in the system to which she would be assigned. The superintendent assigned her to a school 22 miles from her home and the teacher refused to go. . . Imagine yourself as the teacher:

| | | | |
|--------|------|------|-----|
| Part A | 1.70 | 3.71 | .34 |
| Part B | 1.26 | 4.34 | .37 |

9. Contrary to the principal's requests, an otherwise competent teacher consistently declined to participate in community activities or to take responsibility for extra

a. ^aThese items have been included in the final scale.

curricular activities which were not stipulated in his contract. . . Imagine yourself as the teacher:

Part A

1.83 6.58 .43

Part B

2.38 7.95 .53

^a10. The school board rules explicitly stated that teachers should not participate in the local school board elections. One teacher made a public statement that one of the present board members was a professional politician, and otherwise actively engaged in the campaign. . . Imagine yourself as the teacher:

Part A

2.93 9.48 .59

Part B

3.17 10.71 .62

11. Several teachers appeared at several school board meetings to discuss their complaints about over-crowded conditions, outdated textbooks and lack of adequate facilities. At one of the meetings, the school board refused to recognize the teachers, while it proceeded to discuss the purchase of new band uniforms. The teachers persisted in their complaints. . . Imagine yourself as one of the teachers:

Part A

1.58 5.56 .35

Part B

3.17 10.49 .67

12. The principal had requested teachers to submit their lesson plans at the beginning of the semester. One teacher refused to comply with the directive. . . Imagine yourself as the teacher:

Part A

.97 3.25 .37

Part B

3.11 10.75 .63

13. The administration issued a directive that all teachers should sign a loyalty oath. One teacher refused to do so, stating that it impinged on his rights of free speech and association. . . Imagine yourself as the teacher:

Part A

1.86 5.99 .43

Part B

2.64 7.97 .54

14. In one school, the principal was always inclined to favor the male teachers. One teacher felt that this should not be the case and severely criticized the administration. The principal asked the teacher to refrain from attacking the administration, suggesting that it was subordination, but the teacher persisted. . . Imagine yourself as the teacher:

Part A

2.30 8.28 .49

Part B

3.17 11.41 .62

^a15. A principal occasionally changed the grade given by one of his teachers, if a student's complaint to him seemed to justify a higher grade. One teacher protested; she was told by the principal that he had the final responsibility for whatever happened in the school. He asked her to understand. . . Imagine yourself as the teacher:

Part A

1.83 10.19 .60

Part B

3.27 11.10 .65

^a16. The administration requested teachers not to use a standard textbook in American Government because it was "socialistically inclined." A history teacher felt that the book was the best available and proceeded to submit an order for it. . .

Imagine yourself as the teacher:

Part A

2.18 7.17 .55

Part B

3.53 13.52 .70

^a17. The administration changed a course of study which had included philosophy and music appreciation to one which was based almost completely on the sciences and mathematics. A committee of teachers went to see the principal and voiced disapproval. They were told that the administration was in a better position to make the decision. . . Imagine yourself as the teacher:

Part A

2.23 8.25 .56

Part B

3.08 9.64 .58

^a18. A chemistry teacher took an active public stand in favor of water fluoridation in a community that was divided on the issue. The superintendent requested him to avoid becoming further involved in the issue. . . Imagine yourself as the teacher:

Part A

3.40 14.37 .76

Part B

3.25 11.07 .65

^a19. The superintendent insisted that all teachers live in the district in which they presently teach. One teacher continued to live in another section of the city. . . Imagine yourself as the teacher:

Part A

2.45 8.83 .56

Part B

2.71 7.76 .49

20. A math teacher repeatedly gave a student of low ability the maximum passing grade. A committee of teachers had discussed the situation and found that the teacher's friendship with the student's parents was influencing his grading. They went to the principal. The principal admonished the teacher and told her to grade on an objective basis. At the next grading period, the student again received the highest maximum grade. . . Imagine yourself as the teacher:

Part A

2.23 5.98 .45

Part B

3.11 10.65 .61

^a21. The administration issued a directive that teachers should help to improve parent-teacher relations. A parent-teacher committee was established to help select textbooks. One math teacher refused to participate, stating that members of such a committee are not qualified to select textbooks. . . Imagine yourself as the teacher:

Part A

2.74 10.50 .63

Part B

2.91 9.03 .57

22. The principal recommended the advancement of a particular English teacher. A committee of English teachers went to him and questioned his recommendation, on the grounds that the teacher is not qualified to teach that subject. The principal refused to discuss the matter stating that teacher promotion was solely his responsibility. . . Imagine yourself as the teacher:

Part A

2.18 7.22 .46

Part B

3.49 12.42 .69

23. The administration stated that, due to increased enrollment, teachers would have to teach during the summer with a proportionate increase in pay. The teachers generally voiced opposition to this ruling. One said that she would not do it. . . Imagine yourself as the teacher:

| | | | |
|--------|------|------|-----|
| Part A | 2.23 | 8.25 | .46 |
| Part B | 3.08 | 9.66 | .60 |

24. A principal's wife was hired as a teacher solely upon his recommendation. Several teachers opposed this action in that they felt his personal involvement precluded objective evaluation and selection. The principal refused to discuss the matter. . . Imagine yourself as the teacher:

| | | | |
|--------|------|-------|-----|
| Part A | 2.51 | 8.12 | .47 |
| Part B | 3.60 | 12.61 | .65 |

25. One school system did not permit students to read several American literature classics by Faulkner, Hemmingway, Steinbeck and others. One English teacher actively sought to have the policy repealed by soliciting the support of certain influential citizens in the community. The principal asked her to desist in her campaign against the policy because she was stirring up trouble for the school. She said that her action had the support of the National English Teachers' Association. . . Imagine yourself as the teacher:

| | | | |
|--------|------|-------|-----|
| Part A | 2.20 | 7.11 | .53 |
| Part B | 4.23 | 21.62 | .81 |

26. In one school, male teachers received preference in promotions. A group of women teachers at the school complained to the school board. They were told that the situation would be changed, but it was not. One woman who was passed over for a promotion wrote a letter to the NEA and State Department of Education. The principal ordered her to stop stirring up trouble. . . Imagine yourself as the teacher:

| | | | |
|--------|------|-------|-----|
| Part A | 2.64 | 10.98 | .57 |
| Part B | 3.14 | 11.08 | .63 |

STATEMENTS ON THE CRITICISM CHECKLIST
RANKED IN ORDER OF FREQUENCY MENTIONED
(PART IV, "THINGS THAT HAPPEN")

| Rank
(Mentioned
"very often") | Number of Times Mentioned | | Item: Reflects Criticism of: |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| | Occurs
Very Often | Occurs Very
Often and Often | |
| 5 | 18 | 54 | <u>The Administration's Use of Authority</u>
Teachers are required to join a professional society against their will. |
| 17 | 9 | 25 | Assignments of teaching duties are made without regard for the teacher's training or experience. |
| 19 | 8 | 24 | Teachers are criticized by the administration when it does not have any understanding of the problem. |
| 13 | 12 | 41 | The principal will not protect his faculty from pressures from parents. |
| 4 | 21 | 69 | The loyalty of teachers to the administration is used as a criteria for promotion rather than their professional merits. |
| 20 | 7 | 43 | The administration takes credit for the school's successes, but attributes the failures to the teachers. |
| 15 | 10 | 49 | Advancement is based on personal preference rather than objective evaluation of teacher capabilities. |
| 11 | 13 | 49 | Teachers are promoted for conditions other than demonstrating professional ability. |
| | | | <u>The School Board</u> |
| 18 | 16 | 52 | The faculty feels that the school board lacks professional training in education and is, therefore, incompetent. |
| 12 | 13 | 34 | Maximum and minimum salaries, together with increases, are arbitrarily determined by the board on an individual basis at the board's discretion. |

| <u>The School's Policy</u> | | | |
|----------------------------|----|-----|--|
| 10 | 14 | 50 | There is little cooperation between parents, teachers and administration on school problems. |
| 1 | 45 | 136 | Competative athletics and/or other extra-curricular activities are emphasized over academic subjects. |
| 3 | 23 | 97 | Extra-curricular activities absorb too much of the students' and teachers' time. |
| | | | <u>The Decision Making Process</u> |
| 21 | 7 | 34 | The administration does not allow teachers to choose their own subject matter. |
| 6 | 17 | 59 | The School Board fails to consider suggestions and criticisms made by teachers. |
| 9 | 15 | 85 | A teacher has to go through too many channels to get something accomplished. |
| | | | <u>Colleagues (Social Climate)</u> |
| 16 | 9 | 32 | Faculty members are afraid to believe anyone. They guard their talk with one another for fear of reprisal. |
| 14 | 11 | 38 | A teacher will turn around and look both ways before she opens her mouth. |
| 18 | 8 | 29 | One feels pressures from other faculty members to comply with unwritten rules. E.g., Don't be bossy, don't tell too much to the principal, don't be a chisler. |
| 7 | 17 | 55 | One hears severe criticisms of teachers in public places. |
| 22 | 4 | 37 | Community pressures prevent teachers from presenting materials which the community feels are controversial. |
| 2 | 30 | 87 | There is little communication between parents and teachers within parent-teacher organizations. |

Possible Responses were: (1) very often, (2) often, (3) seldom, and (4) never.

Appendix II-e

INTERNAL CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS OF EMPLOYEE AND
PROFESSIONAL STATUS ORIENTATION SCALE ITEMS
("VIEWS OF THE TEACHER'S JOB, PART V")

| Employee Status Orientation Items | Internal Consistency Analysis | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|-------|-------------|------|------|
| | Subscale | | Total Scale | | |
| | SVDR | C.R. | SVD | SVDR | C.R. |
| I. <u>Teacher-Administration Role Orientation Items</u> | | | | | |
| A. Administrative Orientation | | | | | |
| *1. <u>Teachers should adjust their teaching to the administration's views of good educational practice.</u> (80%) ^a | .13 | 11.5 | .29 | .56 | 8.26 |
| *2. <u>Typically, the school administration is better qualified to judge what is best for education than is the teacher.</u> (80%) ^b | .74 | 15.11 | .42 | .54 | 8.11 |
| *3. <u>Teachers should be obedient, respectful and loyal to the principal.</u> (80%) ^b | .58 | 7.51 | .81 | .50 | 6.46 |
| *4. <u>In case of a dispute in the community over whether a controversial textbook or controversial speaker should be permitted in the school, teachers should look primarily to the judgment of the administration for guidance.</u> (62%) ^b | .55 | 8.58 | .36 | .55 | 8.56 |
| *5. <u>Personnel who openly criticize the administration should be encouraged to go elsewhere.</u> (62%) ^b | .60 | 11.54 | .31 | .44 | 7.01 |
| *6. <u>A teacher should not allow herself or himself to be influenced by the opinions of those teachers whose ideas do not reflect the thinking of the administration.</u> (62%) | .68 | 13.37 | 1.33 | .52 | 7.58 |
| *7. <u>The only way a teacher can keep out of "hot water" is to follow the wishes of the top administration.</u> (80%) | .42 | 5.86 | 1.01 | .39 | 5.15 |

^aPercentages in parentheses refer to the proportion of judges which classified it correctly.

^bThe descriptive part of the item is included in the role behavior part of the scale.

*These items are included on the final scale.

The possible responses on this part of the questionnaire were: "strongly agree", "agree", "undecided", "disagree", and "strongly disagree."

8. The work of the school system should be so coordinated that the chief administrator has a fairly good idea of what transpires in every course during any month. (62%)

.40 6.38 .97 .34 5.18

9. A teacher should not be expected to give the administration whatever it wants. (80%)

.45 8.46 .61 .25 3.33

10. A teacher should comply to the demands of the administration only insofar as she/he feels that those demands are of benefit to public education. (80%)

.19 2.78 .87 .05 NS

11. A teacher should consistently practice his or her ideas of the best educational practices even though the administration prefers other views. (62%)

.31 4.41 .37 .16 2.22

B. Loyalty to the Organization

*12. What is best for the school is best for education.

.54 9.50 .85 .35 4.98

*13. A good teacher should put the interests of his school above everything else. (100%)^b

.74 13.60 1.12 .44 6.40

*14. In case of doubt about whether a particular practice is better than another, the primary test should be what seems best for the overall reputation of the school. (80%)

.70 10.90 1.05 .44 5.90

*15. A good teacher should put the interests of his department above everything else. (62%)

.67 11.98 1.03 .41 5.92

16. A good teacher should compromise teaching standards and professional ideals about good teaching when the practice of them disrupts the coordination of the school system. (80%)

.55 8.19 .80 .31 4.34

17. This school should not expect to have my whole-hearted loyalty and support. (100%)

.39 5.87 .56 .26 3.54

18. What is best for education will not necessarily increase the school's prestige or public relations. (52%)

.33 4.27 .60 .25 3.52

C. Experience

*19. Pay should be in relation to teaching experience. (100%)^b

.57 9.35 .52 .40 2.71

20. When a principal considers a teacher for promotion, one of the important factors he should consider is length of experience on the job. (100%)

21. The skills of a teacher should be evaluated primarily on his/her experience in the profession. (100%)

22. If an additional year were to be added to the teacher training program, it should be primarily devoted to more actual classroom teaching experience. (80%)

23. A teacher's reputation for teaching should be based on classroom performance. (100%)

24. Many experienced teachers are incompetent. (100%)

*25. Often, classroom experience simply gives a teacher the opportunity to practice his mistakes. (80%)

D. Interchangeability

*26. Teachers teaching the same subject throughout the system should follow the same kind of lesson plans. (100%)^b

*27. Teachers should teach their course in such a way that a substitute can take over at a moment's notice without serious interruption. (80%)

*28. The work of a course should be so planned that every child taking the same kind of course throughout the state will cover the same material in the same semester. (80%)

29. At present, class size can be doubled without crucially effecting the quality of education. (80%)

30. Persons who do not achieve the minimum standards for a course should not be passed to the next grade until they have. (62%)

*31. A good teacher should be able to efficiently teach the children what they need to know in the limited time available. (80%)^p

32. A good educational program should include a large proportion of required courses (80%)

33. It is unrealistic to expect everyone

| | | | 335 | |
|--|-----|-------|------|------|
| | .57 | 9.67 | .51 | .57 |
| | | | | 1.67 |
| | .53 | 7.54 | .20 | .53 |
| | | | | 1.07 |
| | .22 | 3.10 | .81 | .28 |
| | | | | 4.01 |
| | .13 | 1.75 | .21 | .11 |
| | | | | 1.49 |
| | .55 | 9.40 | .31 | .11 |
| | | | | 1.43 |
| | .67 | 10.54 | .60 | .35 |
| | | | | 3.12 |
| | .50 | 8.34 | 1.02 | .38 |
| | | | | 5.61 |
| | .48 | 7.002 | .97 | .39 |
| | | | | 5.18 |
| | .59 | 9.80 | .95 | .33 |
| | | | | 4.50 |
| | .34 | 3.99 | .28 | .22 |
| | | | | 2.74 |
| | .29 | 4.10 | .14 | .05 |
| | | | | .71 |
| | .43 | 6.27 | .91 | .37 |
| | | | | 5.22 |
| | .25 | 3.21 | .74 | .33 |
| | | | | 4.56 |

| | | | | | |
|--|-----|------|------|-----|------|
| to have learned the same thing in a particular course. (62%) | .48 | 5.57 | .29 | .18 | 2.27 |
| 34. Every teacher's procedures, assignments and rate of progress through a course should be unique to him and his own sense of judgment. (62%) | .40 | 5.92 | .26 | .11 | 1.56 |
| 35. Large classes lower the quality of education. (62%) | .19 | 2.67 | .22 | .10 | 1.46 |
| 36. Teachers should not be transferred from one school to another as the need arises. (62%) | .17 | 2.38 | .02 | .01 | .08 |
| 37. A teacher who keeps abreast of her plan for teaching the course does a better job than the one who consistently falls behind trying to adapt to individual students. (80%) | .13 | 1.81 | .38 | .14 | 1.79 |
| E. Rules and Procedures ⁺ | | | | | |
| *38. <u>A teacher should be required to be completely familiar with the written descriptions of the rules, procedures manuals and other standard operating procedures necessary for running the classroom.</u> (100%) ^b | .54 | 5.78 | .93 | .47 | 6.76 |
| *39. <u>The school should have a manual of rules and regulations which are to be followed seriously.</u> (100%) ^b | .50 | 5.83 | .59 | .44 | 5.49 |
| 40. Failure to maintain records in accordance with specified procedures should be grounds for dismissal. (100%) | .45 | 6.96 | .75 | .30 | 4.10 |
| 41. A teacher should be required to be completely familiar with the written descriptions of the rules, procedures, manuals and other standard operating procedures necessary for running the school. (100%) | .43 | 6.12 | .66 | .26 | 3.44 |
| *42. <u>Rules stating when teachers should arrive and depart from the building should be strictly enforced.</u> (100%) | .45 | 6.43 | 1.02 | .40 | 5.73 |
| *43. <u>To prevent confusion and friction among the staff, there should be a rule covering almost every problem that might come up at the school.</u> (100%) ^b | .57 | 8.61 | .87 | .34 | 4.64 |
| *44. <u>There should be definite rules specifying the topics that are not appropriate for discussion in a classroom.</u> (62%) | .54 | 8.31 | 1.15 | .42 | 6.18 |

⁺Several of the items on this subscale are taken from Explorations in Role Analysis, by Neal Gross and his assistants.

*45. When a controversy arises about the interpretation of school rules, a teacher should not "stick his neck out" by taking a definite position. (62%)^b

46. Every school should expect that there will always be rules that virtually everyone ignores. (100%)

47. The teacher should be expected to abide by the spirit of school rules, rather than to stick to the letter of such rules. (80%)

48. A teacher should be able to "cut the red tape" to get something done quickly. (80%)

49. Rules about reporting procedures should not be taken seriously as long as the reports are accurate. (80%)

50. School rules are only a framework within which the teacher operates; day to day decisions always demand that the teacher use his own professional judgment in interpreting them. (62%)

51. Though school rules should be adhered to, there are always some exceptional cases in which the teacher should be expected to use his own judgment. (62%)

II. Public-Teacher Role Orientation

52. Whenever possible, teachers should try to implement the advice of parents or the PTA concerning their teaching practices. (100%)

*53. Teachers should take into account the opinions of their community in guiding what they say in class and in their choice of teaching materials. (100%)

*54. A teacher should not publicly advocate a position on the place of religion in the school which differs greatly from the majority opinion of the community. (100%)^b

*55. A good teacher is one who conforms, in general, to accepted standards in the community. (100%)^b

*56. The major criterion of a good school is one that serves the needs of the local community. (100%)^b

| | | | | |
|-----|------|------|-----|------|
| | | | 337 | |
| .44 | 6.03 | 1.04 | .44 | 6.52 |
| .32 | 4.53 | .49 | .20 | 2.66 |
| .56 | 4.72 | .29 | .14 | 1.89 |
| .30 | 3.96 | .43 | .22 | 3.02 |
| .37 | 5.18 | .21 | .09 | 1.17 |
| .29 | 3.76 | .21 | .11 | 1.27 |
| .09 | 1.01 | .25 | .17 | 1.91 |
| .42 | 5.34 | .69 | .28 | 3.63 |
| .58 | 8.02 | .92 | .41 | 5.84 |
| .56 | 8.37 | 1.06 | .43 | 5.96 |
| .61 | 9.13 | 1.45 | .58 | 8.76 |
| .56 | 7.67 | .81 | .40 | 5.46 |

57. The teacher's primary responsibility is to serve the community that hires him/her. (100%)

.62 9.37 1.18 .50 7.68

*58. A teacher should not attempt to discuss any controversial issues (such as abolishing the House UnAmerican Activities Committee) which may jeopardize the school's public relations. (80%)^b

.62 9.37 1.11 .45 6.70

*59. Local control over schools by school boards represents the most fundamental form of democracy in public education. (80%)

.51 7.00 .95 .38 5.37

60. Teachers should not be required to participate in community organizations and activities unless they want to. (100%)

.26 3.02 .37 .21 2.55

61. A good teacher is not always the one who is admired and respected by the parents. (80%)

.43 5.06 .28 .16 2.02

62. Typically, the well-meaning parent does not know what will best serve his child's interest. (62%)

.30 3.75 .13 .07 .80

63. What is best for education will not always necessarily increase the school's prestige or public relations. (62%)

.28 3.25 .20 .12 1.45

Internal Consistency Analysis

Professional Status Orientation Items

Subscale Total Scale

SVDR C.R. SVD SVDR C.R.

I. Teacher-Client Role Orientations

*1. It should be permissible for the teacher to violate a rule if he/she is sure that the best interests of the students will be served in doing so. (80%)^b

.65 10.05 .64 .36 4.28

*2. Unless she is satisfied that it is best for the student, a teacher should not do anything which she is told to do. (80%)^b

.66 10.61 .51 .35 3.07

*3. A good teacher should not do anything he believes may jeopardize the interests of his students regardless of who tells him to or what the rule states. (80%)^b

.58 10.04 .78 .36 5.22

4. Principals should reward teachers who spend extra time talking to students and helping them with their problems. (80%)

.63 10.07 .74 .29 3.87

5. Teachers should be more concerned about the adequacy of the school's counseling and guidance program. (62%)

.29 3.87 .55 .31 4.01

6. Giving the students what they want does not necessarily serve the best educational interests of the students. (80%)

.14 1.48 .10 .09 .88

II. Teacher-Colleague Role Orientation

*7. Teachers should try to live up to what they think are the standards of their profession even if the administration or the community does not seem to respect them. (100%)^b

.49 7.34 .66 .39 5.21

*8. One primary criterion of a good school should be the degree of respect that it commands from other teachers around the state. (80%)

.54 7.73 .67 .35 4.48

9. School administrators should not belong to classroom teachers' professional organizations. (80%)

.34 4.73 .49 .17 2.24

*10. A teacher should try to put her standards and ideals of good teaching into practice even if the rules or procedures of the school prohibit it. (80%)^b

.51 9.24 .87 .40 5.84

11. A teacher should present both the pros and cons of various controversial social and political issues in class. (80%)

.40 5.74 .54 .32 3.81

*12. Teachers should subscribe to and diligently read the standard professional journals. (80%)^b

.44 6.11 .65 .37 4.70

*13. A teacher should be an active member of at least one professional teaching association, and attend most conferences and meetings of the association. (80%)^b

.52 7.02 .51 .36 4.62

14. Teachers should have the right to discuss controversial issues in the classroom. (80%)

.45 6.31 .55 .30 3.88

*15. A teacher should consistently practice his/her ideas of the best educational practices even though the administration prefers other views. (62%)^b

.47 7.13 .81 .38 5.53

16. In view of the teacher shortage, a school should not be obliged to release teachers for attendance at the conventions of their professional organizations. (100%)

.37 5.50 .39 .17 2.19

A. Monopoly of Knowledge

17. If an additional year were to be added to the teacher training program, it should be primarily devoted to more independent research. (80%)

.44 6.26 .39 .16 2.15

| | | | | | |
|---|-----|------|------|-----|------|
| | | | | 340 | |
| 18. A teacher who has earned superior grades while in college should be a better teacher than one who earned average grades. (80%) | .43 | 6.47 | .93 | .34 | 5.02 |
| 19. Pay should be in direct relation to the number of years of formal education the teacher has. (80%) | .54 | 8.00 | .59 | .24 | 3.00 |
| 20. If an additional year were to be added to the teacher training program, it should be primarily devoted to a more thorough study of the psychology of learning. (80%) | .35 | 4.83 | .20 | .09 | 1.21 |
| *21. <u>The major skill which a teacher should develop is his/her acquaintance with the subject matter.</u> (80%) ^b | .53 | 8.10 | .80 | .33 | 4.84 |
| 22. A teacher's skill should be based primarily on his acquaintance with educational literature and research. (80%) | .48 | 6.44 | .51 | .28 | 3.44 |
| *23. <u>Teachers should be evaluated primarily on the basis of their knowledge of the subject that they teach and on the basis of their ability to communicate it.</u> (80%) ^b | .36 | 4.58 | .71 | .36 | 4.94 |
| *24. <u>Schools should hire no one to teach unless he holds at least a 4 year bachelors degree.</u> (80%) | .28 | 3.96 | 1.05 | .39 | 5.29 |
| *25. <u>In view of the teacher shortage, it should be permissible to hire teachers trained at non-accredited colleges.</u> (80%) ^b | .38 | 5.48 | .49 | .35 | 2.22 |
| 26. Teachers should have their teaching loads lightened in order to provide additional time to prepare for their courses. (62%) | .21 | 3.06 | .34 | .34 | 4.18 |
| III. <u>Teacher-Administrator Role Orientation</u>
(Decision-Making Authority) | | | | | |
| *27. <u>A teacher should be able to make his own decisions about problems that come up in the classroom.</u> (80%) ^b | .54 | 7.06 | .39 | .34 | 4.18 |
| *28. <u>Small matters should not have to be referred to someone higher up for a final answer.</u> (62%) ^b | .62 | 7.97 | .48 | .44 | 4.86 |
| 29. The principal should not expect to visit a teacher's classroom unless specifically invited by the teacher. (80%) | .35 | 4.43 | .28 | .14 | 1.65 |
| *30. <u>The ultimate authority over the major educational decisions should be</u> | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|-----|------|-----|--------------------|------|
| <u>exercised by professional teachers.</u> (100%) ^b | .52 | 7.51 | .96 | ³⁴¹ .42 | 5.51 |
| 31. Decisions concerning standard text-books and references should be made by the State Department of Education, and not teachers or groups of teachers. (80%) | .49 | 6.00 | .48 | .29 | 2.81 |
| 32. The principal should be free to interrupt a teacher's classwork if he feels it is necessary. (62%) | .36 | 4.79 | .44 | .18 | 2.18 |
| 33. Written orders from higher up should not be followed unquestioningly. (80%) | .59 | 9.24 | .69 | .26 | 3.57 |

Appendix II-f

CARRY SHEET

Part VI

Instructions: On the following pages is a list of types of decisions which must be made in any school system.

- a. Will you please indicate which official, or group, should have the final authority to approve or veto each of these decisions in case there is any dispute. Indicate your answer by placing a check mark (✓) under the column heading that most closely approximates your strongest preference.
- b. Secondly, for each of the issues listed below, please indicate who normally does have the final authority to make each decision in your own school, as far as you know.

Please use the following list of alternatives in answering which official, or group should have the final authority to approve or veto each of these decisions and who normally does have final authority to make each decision.

1. The individual teachers involved.
2. Teachers professions.
3. The teaching faculty.
4. A committee of teachers appointed by the principal.
5. The principal in consultation with the teachers.
6. The principal.
7. The superintendent.
8. State Department of Education.
9. School board members.
10. Committees of parents.
11. Undecided

Note:

Please fold sheet on dotted line and use the above alternative answers in responding to each of the following items in regards to (1) who should and (2) who actually does have the final authority to approve to veto each of these decisions in case there is any dispute.

THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

Code Number _____

| TYPE OF DECISION | Who Should Have Final Authority to Approve Or Veto? | | | | | | | | | | | Who Actually Does? (Write in #) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|---------------------------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | |
| * 1. Selection of required textbooks. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| * 2. Selection of supplementary reading matter. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ** 3. Determining the required courses. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ** 4. Adding or dropping courses. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ** 5. Adding or dropping a program of courses. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ** 6. Hiring new teachers. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| * 7. Dismissing present teachers. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| * 8. Determining whether a faculty member should have tenure. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ** 9. Determining whether faculty members should be promoted to a higher position of authority. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a 10. Ruling on teachers grievances. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| * 11. Allowing permission to outside groups to speak to students. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a 12. Allowing outside groups to use school property. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| * 13. Formulating instructional policy. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ** 14. Deciding whether to renew a teacher's contract. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ** 15. Promoting a teacher to department head or other supervisory position. | | | | | | | | | | | | |

a Omitted from final scale

* Professionally relevant decision--i.e., important to professionally oriented teachers

** Non professionally relevant decisions

Appendix II-g

INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

Code Number _____

Part VII

In this section of the questionnaire you are being asked to report as accurately and candidly as possible the "degree of tension" among the faculty, and some of the problems that normally arise. As sociologists, we are interested in the types of interpersonal problems that arise among personnel and the conditions that create them rather than in the specific people involved. In cases where names (code numbers) are requested, it is merely to provide a reference for the background characteristics of the parties involved; these code numbers will be treated in strict confidence and anonymity at all times. No one other than a small staff of professional sociologists will see your responses. Please answer the questions as completely and accurately as possible.

1. On the whole, how much tension exists between each of the following groups in your school?

| Types of Faculty Involved | Degree of Tension | | | |
|---|-------------------|----------|--------|------|
| | Severe | Moderate | Slight | None |
| 1. Between teachers and the principal | | | | |
| 2. Between teachers and administrative assistants | | | | |
| 3. Between teachers and the school Board | | | | |
| 4. Between teachers and the superintendent | | | | |
| 5. Between teachers and Department Heads or supervisors | | | | |
| 6. Between one type of teacher and another teacher: | | | | |
| a. Married-single | | | | |
| b. young-old | | | | |
| c. men-women | | | | |
| d. academic-extra-curricular (e.g., athletic, band, etc.) | | | | |
| *e. academic-non academic (e.g., music, art, etc.) | | | | |
| *f. Humanities vs. Science and/or math | | | | |
| *g. Academic vs. Vocational (e.g., shop, home economics, commercial.) | | | | |
| *h. New comers vs. Old Timers | | | | |
| *i. Teachers vs. Custodian | | | | |

* not on the original questionnaire

Cont'd.

| Types of Faculty Involved | Degree of Tension | | | |
|--|-------------------|----------|--------|------|
| | Severe | Moderate | Slight | None |
| *j. Teachers vs. Clerical personnel (e.g., secretaries.) | | | | |
| *k. Teachers within the same subject matter area | | | | |
| Between teachers with BA | | | | |
| 7. Between teachers with MA and others | | | | |
| 8. Between teachers and students | | | | |
| | | | | |

2. Are there teachers of certain subjects between whom there is at least a moderate degree of tension? No Yes
If so, please specify what subjects they teach 1. _____

2. _____

3. Are there any specific subject matter areas between which there is at least a moderate degree of tension (among the teachers)?

☐ No ☐ Yes

If so, please specify at least two of the subject matter areas involved.

1. _____

2. _____

4. You have probably consulted with other teachers and administrators since last September for advice about a problem that has come up in connection with your classroom teaching. Please list below in column (1) the code number of (a) the teachers and (b) the school administrators' with whom you have consulted most frequently. In column (2) indicate the nature of the problems that his consultation concerned, and in column (3) estimate the number of times each person has been consulted during the preceding 12 months.

Code # of Persons Consulted:

Nature of Problem

Number of Times Con-
sulted During the pre-
ceding 12 Months.
(3)

(1)

(2)

A. Teachers*

1. _____

1. _____

1. _____

2. _____

2. _____

2. _____

3. _____

3. _____

3. _____

B. School Administration

1. _____

1. _____

1. _____

2. _____

2. _____

2. _____

3. _____

3. _____

3. _____

*

Use code number if possible

HOW DO THEY RATE

5. Listed below are the code numbers of teachers in your school. Please evaluate each person listed in terms of (a) his knowledge of his subject matter, (b) his ability to communicate his subject matter to students, and (c) the respect that other teachers have for him as a teacher. For each person, place an "X" in the square indicating the quality of his performance with respect to each of the criteria listed.

| Code Number of Teacher | Knowledge of subject | | | | | | Ability to Communicate Subject | | | | | | Respect of other Teachers | | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------|-----------|---------|------|------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|---------|------|------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|---------|------|------|---------------------------|
| | Excellent | Very Good | Average | Fair | Poor | No opportunity to observe | Excellent | Very Good | Average | Fair | Poor | No opportunity to observe | Excellent | Very Good | Average | Fair | Poor | No opportunity to observe |
| 0.01 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| . | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

6. Here is a list of teachers and administrators of your school, by code number. Please indicate below (1) the "degree of tension" that exists between you and each party listed; (2) the number of open disagreements or disputes (if any) you have had with each person during the past 2 years; and (3) a brief description of what each dispute was about.

| Teacher Code Number | (1)
Degree of Tension Between you and each teacher | (2)
Number of open disagreements between you and each teacher | (3)
Brief description of what dispute was about |
|---------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | |
| 0.01 | | | |
| . | | | |
| 1.00 | | | |

Part VII

7. Now consider the open disagreements that you have just reported. Please select two or three disputes which stand out most in your mind in which you were involved and describe in some detail on this page the events that transpired; i.e., the issue and the parties involved and the present status of the issue. (If you have not been involved in such disputes, please describe the disputes you know about involving others.)

1.

2.

3.

(Please turn page over and use back)

During the course of the study, several methodological assumptions pressed into focus, which merit further exposition. They concern customary procedures of analysis, measurement, and statistical inference. It is advisable to explicate here the ways in which these procedures are intended to be interpreted in this report.

Measurement

One recurrent issue in measurement systems that use the reports of respondents concerns the relative merits of global questions as opposed to relatively specific and detailed ones. The obvious advantage of global measures is their brevity and simplicity. Lazarsfeld and Thielens, for example, used a global question to assess the power situation in universities (1). They asked faculty members, "If you had to choose one, who would you say has the most powerful voice here on this campus, in determining the degree of academic freedom that exists here--the students, or who?" A similar question has been used in the study being reported here to assess the degree of conflict in schools--i.e., "How much tension is there between (several groups)?" In another part of the study, the degree of centralization of power has been measured in terms of responses to such general statements as: (1) "A teacher should be able to make his own decisions about problems that come up in the classroom," and (2) "The ultimate authority over the major educational decisions should be exercised by professional teachers."

Rather than asking him what may be arbitrarily chosen specifics, such procedures allow the respondent to determine for himself which particular issues are important in these matters. On the other hand, as Patchen points out, unless respondents are asked about specific issues, each one may be thinking of a different set of specifics, or he weighs them in different ways (2). On this assumption, the rates of conflict in the schools also have been computed on the basis of the rate at which specific conflicts were reported per interview; and centralization of the power structure has been inferred from respondents' reports on who actually makes specific decisions about specific practices such as hiring, firing, grievance procedures, textbook--selection, etc.

Patchen reports conclusions from two studies in which both global and specific measures were used as indices of the influence of members at different levels in the organizations (3). Within non supervisory employee units, less variance was found on the index of specific items than on the global measure. This was true in both studies. Moreover, the specific index of items was able to differentiate among work groups in terms of how much influence they perceived at each level, while the global influence measure showed no significant differences among work groups. It was also found that the amount of variance in responses to single specific items was smaller than the variance in responses to global influence questions, and that the amount of variance on single specific influence items was generally larger than for the index based on many specific questions.

-
1. Lazarsfeld, Paul & Thielens, Wagner, The Academic Mind (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1958), pp. 404-409.
 2. Patchen, Martin, "Alternative Questionnaire Approaches to the Measurement of Influence in Organizations", The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LXIX (July 1963), pp. 41-52.

Appendix XII

One reservation which Patchen attributes to the index type of item is that, depending upon the specific area of influence is being judged, considerable differences in variance sometimes arise. Another reservation that seems to apply to specific indices is that, as the level being judged becomes more distant from the respondent, the variance in judgments increases. Furthermore, Patchen found very poor agreement between persons at non-supervisory and supervisory levels about the influence structure. This was true when both global influence questions were used and when the index measure was used.

Patchen concludes that an index based on reports of influence in specific areas shows better reliability among non-supervisory respondents than does the global influence measure. However, there was poor agreement across organization levels, and neither measure showed clear superiority as a predictor of employee morale. The specific item measure, he suggests, is a better indicator of actual influence patterns, but the global measure is more likely to elicit respondents' perceptions of the actual influence pattern.

Regardless of the logical merits and disadvantages of these two types of measures, it is worth noting that they seem to have lead Patchen to the same conclusions: neither measure was associated with employee morale. Different indicators of the same phenomena, as a matter of fact, often seem to lead to similar conclusions. For example, in chapter 5 a rank order correlation of $r_s = +.82$ was found between schools ranked on the basis of global measures of tension and a specific index based on the number of incidents reported per interview; and the rank order correlation between centralization, as measured by a global index and a specific measure of professionally nonrelevant items is $r_s = +.92$. It is notable that what seem to be different types of indicators often produce similar (though not identical) conclusions. This may be true even when simple indicators are used to measure relatively complex concepts. Local and cosmopolitan orientations have been assessed variously by a sole question concerning whether or not the opinions of local colleagues or of those around the country are more important,⁽⁴⁾ and by a large configuration of variables⁽⁵⁾. There is little conclusive evidence that complex indicators produce different conclusions than simpler ones. In the present study, the answer to a single, rather limited, situation is taken as the sole criteria of cosmopolitan orientation; while several indicators of cosmopolitan behavior are used, they are, nevertheless, hardly inclusive.

It appears that the specific indicators selected do not appreciably alter the conclusions. For example, it was noted that as the criteria for operationally identifying the professional and employee validating groups for the present study were experimented with, the particular criteria used sometimes changed the data but rarely changed the conclusions. For example, the differences between the high and low employee validating groups, as they were defined in chapter 5, appeared in only slightly greater magnitude when the low group was defined by different criteria (i.e., those who are willing to leave the organization at salary increase up to \$3000 and who check either salary or tenure as needing the greatest improvement in the

³ Patchen, *ibid.*

⁴ Gottlieb, David, "American Graduate Students: Some Characteristics of Aspiring Teachers and Researchers", Journal of Educational Sociology, 52 (1961), pp. 236-240

⁵ Gouldner, Alvin, "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles, I.II", Administrative Science Quarterly, 2 (1957-1958), pp. 281 ff and 444 ff.

school.) Similarly, when the employee groups were classified by using two out of the four criteria, the conclusions were no different than for the small group that met three of the four criteria, although the more stringent criteria produced larger differences.

It would appear, then, that if the various indices are reasonable, they will rank order the data in similar ways. Lazarsfeld and Theilens conclude as much. They term the whole procedure a 'diagnostic process' (6). They found that even though the two indices used to assess the "eminence" of social science professors--productivity and honors--were not highly correlated with one another, when they were correlated with an outside variable the same result was produced. They conclude that if a reasonable collection of indicator items has been used, it does not matter for most purposes which subset is used as the index. However, they also caution, "while this rule of 'interchangeability of indices' is one of the foundations of empirical research, its beneficial consequences are paid for by a serious but unavoidable price. Because we can never reach 'pure' classifications, a certain number of cases must always be misclassified, and therefore the empirical findings are less clear than if we could somehow have precise measures of the variables for which a study is concerned."

A related concern is raised by the small numerical differences between the schools on some of the indices used to rank order them, such as those used to measure centralization. It is important to recognize that these numbers represent ordinal not cardinal measurements. These measures are not necessarily indicative of a precise point from zero. The assumption of equal intervals implicit in using the mean can be made only comparatively for the data at hand. The mean indices should be interpreted only in rank order relationship to other means in the sample and not necessarily as an estimate of the magnitude of difference in the population. The important test of the significance of these differences is not their magnitude, but their reliability as nearly as can be assessed by independent observations. The fact that the schools rank similarly on both the global and specific measures of centralization provides credence for the measures, even though the measures will not permit the magnitude of differences to be determined. It is very possible that by an outside criterion, the schools in the study are clustered within a limited range of the maximum existing range of centralization. A larger sample, and a measure of centralization that is independent of the observations of respondents, would be helpful.

Similarly, persons who answer "strongly agree" on the professional and employee scales are not necessarily four "equal units" different from those who answer "strongly disagree," although they have been weighted that way. Even though they have been requested to estimate the "extent" of their agreement with each statement, it cannot be assumed that an actual measure of the intensity of the respondent's agreement with the statement has been elicited in this way. There is little reason to believe that all respondents use either the same standard of measurement or the same units of measurement; a respondent who expresses "agreement" could actually be in more agreement than another respondent who believes he "strongly agrees." However, while the responses cannot be literally interpreted as a measure of the existing agreement in the population, they can be interpreted as measures of respondents' perceived relationships to the other respondents. So, literally, the method is measuring how respondents think they compare with others. Since it can be assumed that the respondent's estimation of his respective position on issues will influence his behavior, this is in itself an important kind of knowledge.

6 Lazarsfeld and Theilens, op.cit.

7 Ibid, pp. 406

Statistical Inference

A statistic is of utility to the extent that it permits generalization from a sample to a universe. But this is theoretically possible only when the universe has been randomly sampled. The present study is not based on a random sample (although, as indicated in chapter 1, it is not drastically different from a random sample of high schools in many respects); generalizations must be drawn with caution. Technically, the present sample might be considered to be a random sample of some "hypothetical" universe (i.e., one which has the characteristics of this sample). Then, to the extent that public education does have the characteristics of this sample, that degree of generalization is permitted.

In interpreting the meaning of the critical ratio specifically, the question of the sample selection aside, it is important to realize that the power of a statistic cannot be fully utilized unless the alternative has been theoretically specified; otherwise the alternative is assumed to be zero, which in most cases simply means that there is not adequate sociological knowledge from which to derive the type two error. When type two error is not otherwise fixed, it is fixed by the chance of the size of the sample which has been selected. This means that the resulting critical ratio is a function of sample size, which enters the denominator of the critical ratio. Therefore, and differences can be made statistically significant by increasing the sample size. This is one reason why sheer statistical significance is not, in itself, always important. That is why, in cases where type two error has not been specified, smaller samples are preferable to large ones. This is one reason why the number selected for the validating groups has been kept small. Then a significant difference is not only statistically significant, but important.

A related reservation concerns the empirical assumptions that must be made prior to using statistics. For example, it must be assumed that an existing relationship is linear before a linear correlation techniques can be applied. Therefore, a low correlation may not only be due to the absence of a relationship, but to the fact that the correlation takes another form (e.g., it is curvilinear). Rigorous analysis requires tests of relationships other than simple linear ones.

In addition to the sampling procedure, the form of the data, and the assumptions to be met, the appropriateness of a statistic depends on the level of analysis. Many differences are not theoretically interesting; the discovery of a statistically significant difference cannot in itself be the goal of research. On the other hand, at times the demonstration of a sheer difference is one of the most creative aspects of research, because it can raise theoretically important questions or lead to significant findings. For this reason the chi square and critical ratio, which "find differences," have utmost relevance during preliminary analyses when the existence of a difference is in doubt. The use of these statistics are not only justified but essential at these preliminary levels of inquiries, where even small differences can prove to be of importance. But when the difference can be assumed, it is more important to use some measure of contingency of correlation which will assess the importance of the difference. While simple statistical differences can be theoretically significant during preliminary inquiries, at some point in theory construction a measure of correlation or contingency is required in order to assess the importance of the theory being established. The difficulty arises when too much stress is placed on the correlation coefficient during preliminary analysis before the hypothesis has been sufficiently refined; at this point there is a danger that a potentially useful theory will be discarded because it does not meet the tests of a proven theory (8.)

8. For further discussion of these problems, see Roy G. Francis, The Rhetoric of Science (University of Minnesota Press, 1962).

